

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

*Intell Act :
Ind - Pakistan*

31 August 1965

MEMORANDUM FOR: Director of Central Intelligence
THROUGH : Deputy Director for Intelligence
SUBJECT : Comments on "US At Crossroads in
India-Pakistan Policy", by Selig
Harrison--Washington Post, 29 Aug 65

1. In response to your request, we have studied Selig Harrison's article on US policy alternatives in South Asia. It is a cogent and thoughtful analysis of a very complex problem, and we generally agree with Harrison's conclusions. He knows the country and has had long experience there; he appears, moreover, to have been well briefed.
2. Some analysts would perhaps posit yet a fourth alternative: a policy of getting tough with both sides, using our aid leverage to get them to come to terms over Kashmir and their other problems. We believe--and Harrison would probably agree--that this is merely a variation of his disengagement alternative, since the implicit threat involved in such a policy would be one of disengagement.
3. There are several small factual errors or errors of emphasis in Harrison's piece, although they do not affect his conclusions. Among these is his comparison of the Pakistani F-86 and the inferior Indian Mystere IV; the first-line Indian fighter is actually the Hawker Hunter, which is more comparable to the F-86. Another is his overdrawing of Pakistan's

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

CONFIDENTIAL

armored superiority; Pakistan does enjoy a qualitative superiority in medium tanks which is unlikely to be reduced by India's acquisition of Soviet light tanks, but the superiority is not as marked as he states. He also has a fundamental reservation about the possibility of any tacit US-Soviet arms freeze, such as Harrison mentions, in the present state of US-Soviet relations.

25X1

/s/

for

R. J. SMITH
Director of Current Intelligence

Distribution:

- Orig & 1 - Addressee
- 1 - DBI
- 1 - D/OCI
- 1 - AA/IP
- 1 - SDO/Briefer

25X1

OCI/AA/I [] yd/7424(31 Aug 65)

-2-

CONFIDENTIAL

September 24, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

24175

COLOMBIA

Ernest Schein, a former employee of the Philippine War Damage Commission and associate of O'Donnell, registered as a lobbyist May 21, 1962, for the Distribuidora de Azucares, Bogotá, Colombia. Press reports said Schein was receiving \$15,000 a year to represent Colombian sugar interests. His name also figured in the 1963 congressional investigation involving O'Donnell.

SOUTHERN RHODESIA

The firm of Purcell and Nelson registered as a lobbyist March 20, 1964, for Sugar Sales Ltd., of Southern Rhodesia. Reports said the firm was receiving \$5,000 from Rhodesian sugar interests to present their case.

TAIWAN

Robert L. Farrington, a former Agriculture Department official (solicitor, 1954-56; general counsel, 1956-59, among other jobs) registered May 8, 1964, as a lobbyist for the Chinese Government Procurement and Services Mission, Division for Taiwan Sugar Corp. Press reports said he was receiving \$250 a month to represent Taiwanese sugar interests.

MAURITIUS

Washington lawyer James N. Earnest, registered as a lobbyist September 1, 1964, for the Mauritius Sugar Syndicate. Press reports said he was receiving 5,000 British pounds (\$14,000).

SOUTH AFRICA

The law firm of Casey, Lane & Mittendorf registered as a lobbyist June 22, 1962, for the South African Sugar Association. In 1964 the firm reportedly received a fee of \$24,000 from the association.

MADAGASCAR

Seymour S. Guthman registered as a lobbyist May 12, 1964, for the Syndicat des Distillateurs et Producteurs de Sucre de Madagascar, which was said to be paying him \$625 a month.

ADDRESS OF MR. STANISLAW MIKOLAJCZYK

(Mr. DERWINSKI (at the request of Mr. DEVINE) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as we know, the situation in foreign affairs continues to deteriorate, in substantial part due to the failure of the Department of State and the President's foreign policy advisors to recognize the fundamental problems in Eastern Europe. This is especially tragic since there are outstanding exile leaders of the respective captive peoples of Eastern Europe who can properly advise the administration of true conditions within their countries.

One of these outstanding leaders is Mr. Stanislaw Mikolajczyk, chairman of the Polish Peasant Party and former Prime Minister of Poland. I enclose as a continuation of my remarks excerpts from his address before the annual Harvest Thanksgiving Day sponsored by the Alliance of Friends of the Polish Village in America, held in Chicago on September 5:

I myself came from the part of Poland, which enjoyed a relatively higher standard of living—not, because peasants were in majority in this part of Poland, but, because of the advanced industrialization based on the processing of their own agricultural products. In this part of Poland the peasants

were quickly adopting the new methods of production in agriculture, and therefore receiving better harvests from their soil, and higher income from their work in the village. In fact the rural population in that part of Poland was in the minority.

The unfavorable climatic and poor soil conditions were overcome by the independent agricultural organizations and the cooperatives. Also we were helping ourselves by the wide territorial self-government. This is the way it was before the Second World War and this part of Poland is today still leading in the national agricultural production.

Can a citizen of today's Poland even dream about the just cutting of the national loaf of bread?

Certainly, not.

There are no free elections in Poland.

There are no independent agricultural organizations.

And the free territorial self-government does not exist any more.

The last elections in Poland, like the previous ones, were only a Communist comedy. The citizens did not have a right to elect or to choose, but only a right to vote for the Communist agents of Moscow, who were brought to Poland and imposed by Moscow on the Polish nation.

Not Poles, but the Communist agents are deciding about the cutting of the national loaf of bread. In addition, the Communists are using the work of Poles and the income of the Polish Nation to subsidize the Communist aggression against the peoples of the free world.

What is even worse, the Poles deprived of their freedom by the Moscow aggressors are forced to pay for the Communist poisoning of the younger generation and for the Godless education full of lies and immoral depravations.

Poles have to defend Cardinal Wyszyński, Polish clergy and the Catholic Church and help them in their fight against the communization of Poland.

We should increase our efforts, and intensify our fight for the just division of the nation's loaf of bread in Poland, because of the great injustice being committed against the Polish nation.

Today, however, we have to think in global terms. When the Communist aggression against the free world is constantly spreading, you in Chicago took a right stand in your resolutions on the Polish Peasant Day.

You supported in those resolutions the efforts of President Johnson to stop the Communist aggression against the free world—in Tibet where the people were deprived of their freedom and independence,—in Vietnam, and in the Dominican Republic.

We wish the President, as we wish our brothers in Poland, that the efforts and sacrifices of the American people could bring as early as possible the expected results. We wish that out of this fight and sacrifices could also come a relief for our brothers in Poland. We wish that the will and determined fight for equal rights and freedom of all peoples, regardless of their color or origin will also include the Polish people.

We believe that the Polish nation celebrating a thousand years of its Christianity has the same right to independence and freedom as the nations of Far East and Africa, which justly obtained their independence in recent years.

Seventy years of the organized work of the Polish peasant movement is not only an enormous effort of our forefathers with Wincenty Witos as a leader at the top but long years of fight and work for the enlightenment and education in the civil rights of all the common people in Poland. This work has already paid good dividends: After the First World War—free and independent Poland with an access to the Baltic Sea; the

acceptance of the first democratic constitution in 1921; the land reform; the establishment and the organization of the state administration are just a few examples.

This education and tradition have guided us in our fight against the Nazis during World War II, and it helped us very much in the fight against the new Communist occupants of Poland after the war.

The most important result of those 70 years of work and fight of the Polish peasant movement is the fact that out of all the nations behind the Iron Curtain, Poland has today the smallest percentage of the land in the Communist collectives, and Communists have most troubles in their efforts to communize the Polish villages. The few existing Kolchozes in Poland were liquidated by the Polish peasants immediately after Stalin's death.

The ideals of the Polish peasant movement are so deeply rooted in the souls and hearts of the people of Poland, that even the long years of the occupation by the enemy were unable to destroy them.

This is the most important heritage of the Polish peasant movement in its 70 years of work and fight.

We believe that in this heritage lies the power, which in the future will bring to Poland the just cutting of the nation's loaf of bread. Today this heritage forms the base for the great drive of the Polish people toward freedom and independence.

There is no doubt that the Polish nation meets already today all the requirements to qualify her for help from the great free nations of the world in their struggle for independence and freedom.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Mikolajczyk's address was delivered to leaders of Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Lithuania, Serbia, and Ukraine peasant movements who likewise with great authenticity speak for their oppressed brethren held in bondage by the Communist colonial dictatorships. It is my hope that their words and observations will receive more respect and review from our foreign diplomats than they have heretofore.

(Mr. TUPPER (at the request of Mr. DEVINE) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. TUPPER'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. CRAMER (at the request of Mr. DEVINE) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. CRAMER'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, in view of the remarks of the distinguished majority leader, I ask unanimous consent that after completion of the legislative business of the day and special orders previously entered, I be permitted to address the House for 1 hour on December 24, 1965.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

24176

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

September 24, 1965

MEMORIAL TO FORMER SENATOR
ELBERT THOMAS

(Mr. PEPPER (at the request of Mr. GETTYS) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, because of my great affection and regard for former Senator Elbert Thomas I would like to insert in body of RECORD copy of letter I recently wrote his son on the passing of the Senator, and an article from the Washington Post on his death.

SEPTEMBER 21, 1965.

Mr. W. S. THOMAS,
Lawton, Okla.

DEAR Mr. THOMAS: Your loss of your great father and our cherished friend and neighbor for so long in Washington saddened Mrs. Pepper and me very much. I was not only the colleague of your father in the Senate but Mrs. Pepper and I were warm friends of Senator and Mrs. Thomas. Your father was a great statesman, a dedicated American, a devoted public servant, a gracious and charming gentleman.

Mrs. Pepper and I shall ever cherish the memory of our happy associations and friendship with the Senator and Mrs. Thomas. Please extend to the other members of your family our deepest sympathy. Believe me,

Always sincerely,

CLAUDE PEPPER,
Member of Congress.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Sept. 20, 1965]

ELMER THOMAS DIES, 24 YEARS A SENATOR

Former U.S. Senator Elmer Thomas, 89, a Member of Congress for 28 years, died yesterday in a Lawton, Okla., hospital after surgery.

The lifelong Democrat represented Oklahoma in the Senate for 24 years until his defeat in the 1950 primary by Senator MIKE MONRONEY, Democrat, of Oklahoma.

After losing his last senatorial campaign, Mr. Thomas practiced law in Washington until he returned to Oklahoma with his wife in 1957. He once explained why he stayed in Washington even though he was no longer a Senator.

"I'm a bit like a prizefighter—it takes a little time to cool him off before he goes home."

But Mr. Thomas never visited the Senate Chamber where he spent so many years.

"In my time," he said, "I saw so many former Senators hanging around lobbying and asking favors, that it disgusted me."

During his last years in Washington, Mr. Thomas spent much of his time writing three books—"Financial Engineering," "Forty Years a Legislator," and "Legislative History of the Atom Bomb."

He was recognized as an authority on financial affairs, Indian legislation, agriculture, and oil while he was in the Senate.

During the New Deal he was a strong supporter of inflating the currency and making silver legal tender.

"We have taken 43 cents of value out of the dollar during this (the Roosevelt) administration," he said in 1935. "We have got to further cheapen the dollar before we have prosperity."

Mr. Thomas served for many years as chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee.

Before entering the Senate in 1927, he represented Oklahoma's Sixth District in the House.

Mr. Thomas is survived by a son, W. S. Thomas, of Lawton, and three grandchildren.

INTERAMA—H.R. 30

(Mr. PEPPER (at the request of Mr. GETTYS) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, in the debate on H.R. 30 in the House on September 22 I inadvertently failed to comment on the absence from H.R. 30 as amended by the House Foreign Affairs Committee, of the provisions of my H.R. 30 as originally introduced relative to the applicability of the Bacon-Davis Act, as amended (40 U.S.C., sec. 276a-276a-5). I am informed the reason those provisions were deleted from H.R. 30 as amended by the House Foreign Affairs Committee was that the provisions of the Bacon-Davis Act would apply to any contract for the construction, repair or rehabilitation of any exhibit by the United States under H.R. 30 without specific reference thereto being made in H.R. 30.

I wish it definitely understood that I am speaking by the authority of the chairman of the board of trustees of the Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center, the State agency which is the legal authority for the operation of the center, that it commits itself, insofar as it may have legal authority in the matter, to see to it that the Bacon-Davis Act does apply to any construction, repair, or rehabilitation in the center under H.R. 30 as amended.

I am further authorized by the chairman of the Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center Authority to state that the authority commits itself to apply the principles of the Davis-Bacon Act to all construction, repairs, or rehabilitation done by the authority at the center with the use of any funds obtained as a loan from the Community Facilities Administration, an agency of the United States; and agrees to the inclusion of a provision to that effect in the formal agreement evidencing the loan of the Community Facilities Administration to the Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center Authority in respect to any construction, repairs or rehabilitation upon the center premises.

CEASE-FIRE IN KASHMIR

(Mr. PEPPER (at the request of Mr. GETTYS) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, the people of the world have breathed a prayer of gratitude to the United Nations for bringing about a cease-fire in the enlarging war between India and Pakistan in which Communist China was threatening to take a part. All honor and tribute to our great President to whom the principal credit for this mighty achievement is due and to the United Nations which brought it about.

These two great countries of India and Pakistan, like all countries, cannot afford the cost of war in treasure not to speak of the priceless assets of human life. Already it is reported that in the war

thus far each country has spent enough to build a great steel mill—enough to furnish needed food for millions of hungry people and a better life for countless numbers. It is the earnest hope of the world that the United Nations will continue its good offices until there shall be a fair and honorable settlement of the controversy respecting Kashmir between these two great states.

But aside from the termination of the hostilities between India and Pakistan three other great events have emerged from this episode:

First. The resurgence of the power and authority of the United Nations as the peacekeeping organ of the world—a high in the experience of the United Nations dramatically following the saddening low which only a little while ago brought so much concern to the hearts of the peace-loving people of the world.

Second. The cooperation of the United States and the Soviet Union through the United Nations in terminating this tragic and dangerous war—a momentous example of what these two great countries can do in keeping the peace of the world if they will work together as it was intended they should do when the United Nations was formed.

Third. The setback to the aggressive designs of Communist China against India, and after India vast areas beyond, through the strong voice of the United Nations supported in unity and determination by the United States and the Soviet Union—indeed by the great powers which assumed the obligation to work together in the inception of the United Nations.

Mr. Speaker, let us hope that upon the foundation of this meaningful achievement the edifice of the United Nations shall rise to greater and greater majesty as the instrument of peace, justice, and the promotion of human welfare and dignity in the world.

And let us hope most fervidly, Mr. Speaker, that the Soviet Union will see in this experience the reward of working for peace in the world with the United States and the other peace-loving powers and will in the future dedicate itself to following that course. For if the United States and the Soviet Union with their great might and power will honorably and earnestly work together for the peace and the betterment of mankind, of course with the cooperation of most of the other nations of the world anxious for such a course they can stop war, reduce the danger of a nuclear holocaust, bring about disarmament to the point where no nation shall longer be a dangerous aggressor, and lift all mankind to walk on higher ground than its feet have ever trod.

AIR POLLUTION AND ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH

(Mr. SCHEUER (at the request of Mr. GETTYS) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, contamination of the environment is now

September 24, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

24195

The major difference between the two versions of the bill is the authorization by title, resulting in a total authorization of \$1.895 billion in the House bill, and \$1.650 billion in the Senate bill.

The conferees arrived at a compromise figure of \$1.785 billion, which represents an increase of \$135 million over the authorization in the Senate bill, and a decrease of \$110 million from the authorization in the House bill.

The primary difference may be found in title I, where the conferees increased the authorization \$165 million.

The reason for this increase was to provide more money for the Neighborhood Youth Corps, which has had great success both in the number of youths participating, and the benefits resulting from their participation.

The conferees received telegrams from many State officials urging that the authorization for this program be increased.

The Senate conferees have receded from the Senate position in section 209(c) in regard to the Governor's veto power.

As the Senate will recall, during Senate consideration of the bill the Governor's veto was dropped from the bill and the Senate rejected seven or eight amendments to reinstate some form of it.

The Senate position was adopted in conference, in lieu of the House language which permitted the Governor's veto but which permitted the Director of OEO to reconsider such actions and override them.

However, the House subsequently voted to recommit the conference report to conference, with instructions to its conferees to insist on the House position.

On returning to conference, the Senate conferees were reluctant to reconsider and recede on this point.

However, in view of the House action, the Senate conferees agreed to recede and to accept the House language.

The Senate conferees receded from the Senate position which provided for Hatch Act coverage to VISTA volunteers and persons employed by agencies administering or carrying on community action programs, and whose salaries are paid in principal part from funds appropriated under the act.

The exclusion of these provisions was based upon the difficulty of applying the existing statutory restrictions to organizations and agencies for which they were not designed.

In no way did the conferees intend any retreat from the principle that these programs must be conducted in a completely impartial manner, free of any partisan political activity or any activity designed to further the election or defeat of any candidate for public office.

In addition, a letter was received from John W. Macy, Jr., Chairman of the U.S. Civil Service Commission, opposing this Senate amendment.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Macy's letter be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, the remaining differences resolved by the House and Senate conferees were relatively minor in nature.

An explanation of the action taken on these amendments is contained in the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

I ask unanimous consent that the portion of the House conferees' statement in explanation of the conferees' action be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, in conclusion, this bill, the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1965, provides an authorization of funds for fiscal year 1966, and a 1-year extension of the Federal share of financing at 90 percent for programs under title I, parts B and C, and title II of the act.

The legislation was enacted on August 20, 1964, and not funded until October 8, 1964. Involved in its many programs are new concepts to assist in the war on poverty. The progress made thus far deserves our continuing support.

I believe we arrived at an excellent bill in conference, and I urge Senate approval of the conference report.

EXHIBIT 1

U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., September 1, 1965.

HON. PAT McNAMARA,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR McNAMARA: The Civil Service Commission respectfully submits the following views regarding section 18 of H.R. 8283, added by the Senate, making the Hatch Political Activities Act applicable to employees of private nongovernmental agencies which administer or conduct community action programs under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, as amended. The amendment adopted by the Senate would revise section 211 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 by inserting a new subsection (a) as follows:

"(a) Any person who is employed by any agency administering or conducting a community action program receiving assistance under this part and whose salary is paid in principal part from funds appropriated pursuant to this part, shall be deemed to be an officer or employee of a State or local agency for the purposes and within the meaning of the act entitled 'An act to prevent pernicious political activities,' approved August 2, 1939 (53 Stat. 1147) as amended."

The Commission believes that it would be unwise to extend the general political activity restrictions of the Hatch Act to such a sizable group of persons in the private sector of community life.

Before action is taken on the bill the conference managers should appreciate the full scope and impact of this provision which would constitute a major departure from long-standing precedent in legislation of this type, as established by the Hatch Act. Whereas the Hatch Act covers those who occupy positions of public trust as employees of executive agencies of the Federal Government or of State or local governments, the amendment as adopted by the Senate would prohibit certain employees of private organizations from taking any active part in partisan political affairs. The Senate amendment can be read so as to include, potentially, employees of such organizations as legal aid societies, religious and charitable organizations, and other groups which we believe do not normally have any substantial political involvement.

The primary justification for the restrictive provisions of the Hatch Act is found in the fact that those whose political freedom is curtailed are governmental employees who are expected by the general public to refrain from active political partisanship.

Under the 1940 amendments of the Hatch Act, such restrictions are applied to employees of State and local governmental agencies whose principal employment is in connection with activities financed by Federal loans or grants. There again the Congress directed the prohibitions to officers and employees of governmental agencies only.

Of course, the Commission concurs in the view that partisan politics should be kept out of community action programs financed by Federal grants. In this regard it should be noted that existing law goes far to proscribe partisan political activity in community action programs. Section 12 of the Hatch Act prohibits partisan political activity on the part of any officer or employee of a public agency who is principally employed in connection with such an activity financed by Federal loans or grants. The same section of the Hatch Act would also prohibit such an officer or employee from using his official authority or influence for the purpose of interfering with an election or promoting the solicitation of money for political purposes. It is the Commission's position that the Hatch Act will deter most of those engaged in community action programs who otherwise might be inclined to become active in partisan political campaigns.

The Commission believes that the Congress should seriously consider the effect of a legislative prohibition against political activity on the part of private employees. We urge that the amendment be rejected.

By direction of the Commission.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. MACY, Jr.,
Chairman.

EXHIBIT 2

JOB CORPS—DISPLACEMENT OF EMPLOYED WORKERS

The Senate amendment contained a provision, which had no counterpart in the House bill, which prohibited the Director from authorizing a Job Corps program which would result in the displacement of employed workers or impair existing contracts for services. The conferees have agreed upon a compromise under which the Director is required to prescribe regulations to prevent Job Corps programs from displacing presently employed workers or the impairment of existing contracts for services.

JOB CORPS—PAYMENTS TO RECRUITERS

The Senate amendment prohibited the Director from making payments to any individual or organization for the service of referring candidates for enrollment in the Job Corps or names of such candidates. The House bill contained no similar provision. The conference report contains a substitute which provides that the Director shall make no payments to any individual or organization solely as compensation for the service of referring the names of candidates for the Corps.

COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS—ACCESS OF PUBLIC TO INFORMATION

The Senate amendment provided that community action programs must include provisions for feasible access of the public to information, including but not limited to, reasonable opportunity for public hearings at the request of appropriate local community groups. The House bill contained no comparable provision. The conference agreement adopts the Senate provision, except that the word "feasible" is changed to "reasonable."

COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS—TYPES OF PROGRAMS

The present act contains examples of programs which fall within the purposes of community action programs. The Senate amendment added to the list the fields of family planning, consumer credit education, and consumer debt counseling programs. It also gave emphasis to the fact that the list is merely to give examples by providing that the programs falling within the purpose of the part include, but are not limited to, the listed fields. The House bill contained no comparable provision. The conference substitute omits the listing of additional examples of types of permissible programs. It adopts, however, the Senate provision insuring that the listed fields are not the only ones in which programs may be carried. The managers on the part of the House wish it to be understood that the omission of the Senate provision in no way indicates that it is their intention or the intention of the Senate conferees to discourage the continuation and expansion of programs in these fields. Programs in these fields are now being carried on, and are to be encouraged.

COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS—SPECIAL PROGRAMS FOR THE CHRONICALLY UNEMPLOYED POOR

The Senate amendment authorized the Director to make grants for special programs directed at the needs of those chronically unemployed poor persons who have poor employment prospects, and are unable, because of age or otherwise to obtain appropriate employment or training assistance under other programs. These programs, in addition to other services, will enable such persons to participate in projects for the betterment or beautification of the community served by the program, including activities which will contribute to the management, conservation, or development of natural resources, recreational areas, Federal, State, and local government parks, highways, and other lands. The program must be conducted in accordance with standards adequate to assure that the program is in the public interest and otherwise consistent with policies applicable under the act for the protection of employed workers and the maintenance of basic rates of pay and other suitable conditions of employment. It was also provided that \$150 million of the funds appropriated for carrying out title II of the act for the fiscal year 1966 could be used for this purpose. The House bill contained no similar provision. The provisions for these special programs are retained in the substitute agreed upon in conference. However, the provision for earmarking a portion of the funds appropriated for title II for this purpose was not retained.

COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS—SELF-HELP HOUSING REHABILITATION

The Senate amendment contained a provision requiring the Director to give special consideration to programs which would, through self-help, rehabilitate substandard housing and provide instruction in basic skills associated with such rehabilitation. This provision is not included in the substitute agreed upon in conference. However, programs in these fields are now being carried on and are to be encouraged.

Participation of State agencies

The Senate amendment provided for continuing consultation with approximate State agencies in the development, conduct, and administration of community action programs. The conference substitute includes this provision except for the word "continuing."

Disapproval of plans

The present act provides that no assistance can be made available for work-training programs or community action programs until the Governor of the State in which they are to be carried on has been given notice of the

plan for the assistance and has not disapproved it within 30 days.

The House bill amended this provision so that, in the event of the disapproval of a plan by a Governor, the Director could reconsider it, and if he found it fully consistent with the provisions and in furtherance of the purposes of this act, could override the Governor's disapproval.

Pursuant to the instructions of the House, the House conferees have insisted on the inclusion of the House provision in the conference report. The conferees expect that the procedures established by the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity under section 209(a) will include provision for informal hearings held by the Director at the request of the Governor of a State or other interested parties.

COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS—PRIVATE NONPROFIT AGENCIES

The House bill provided that when the Director receives an application for a community action program to be carried out in a community in which a community action agency is carrying on a program consisting of several component programs, he must give notice to that agency. The Senate amendment added a requirement that the Director also give notice to the Governor of the State. The Senate amendment also provided that when the Director determines that a separate contract or grant is desirable and practical and that special cause has been shown, he may make a grant directly to, or contract directly with, such agency.

The conference substitute includes both of these Senate provisions, except that the requirement that "special" cause must be shown before the Director may contract directly has been altered to require "good" cause to be shown.

Voluntary assistance program for needy children

The House bill struck out part C of title II of the act providing for the establishment in the Office of Economic Opportunity a center to encourage voluntary assistance for deserving and needy children. The Senate amendment retained part C, but deleted the provision under which the center was directed to collect the names of persons who voluntarily desire to assist such children financially, and to obtain information concerning deserving and needy children from social welfare agencies.

The conference report adopts the Senate provision.

Indemnity payments to dairy farmers

The Senate amendment extended until June 30, 1966, the program provided for by the act for making indemnity payments to dairy farmers who have been directed to remove their milk from commercial markets because it contained residues of chemicals registered and approved for use at the time of such use. The conference substitute adopts the Senate provision.

Programs for the elderly poor

The Senate amendment added a provision to the act stating the intention of Congress that whenever feasible the special problems of the elderly poor should be considered in the development, conduct, and administration of programs under the act. The conference report retains this provision of the Senate amendment.

The Senate amendment also provided for the establishment in the Office of Economic Opportunity of a Task Force on Programs for the Elderly Poor. The conference substitute does not include this provision.

National Advisory Council

The Senate amendment provided for a National Advisory Council of 21 members with the Director an ex-officio member to review and to make recommendations of the programs under the act. The House bill in-

creased the members from 14 to 20 but made no other changes in the provisions of the act. The House bill provision was accepted by the conferees.

Transfer of funds between titles

The Senate amendment added a section to the act permitting up to 10 percent of the amount appropriated or allocated for any title to be transferred for use in carrying out other titles, but the amount available for use for any title could not be increased by more than 10 percent. The conference substitute includes this provision.

Equitable distribution of benefits between urban and rural areas

The Senate amendment required the Director to adopt such administrative measures as are necessary to assure that benefits of the act will be distributed equitably between residents of rural and urban areas. The substitute agreed upon in conference contains a modification of the Senate provision under which the Director is required to adopt appropriate administrative measures to assure such equitable distribution.

Authorization of appropriations

The House bill authorized the appropriation for fiscal year 1966 of \$825 million to carry out title I of the act. The Senate amendment authorized the appropriation for such year of \$535 million for such purpose. The amount fixed in conference is \$700 million.

The House bill authorized the appropriation for fiscal year 1966 of \$680 million to carry out title II of the act. The Senate amendment authorized the appropriation for such year of \$880 million for such purpose. The conference substitute authorizes the appropriation for such purpose for such year of \$850 million.

The House bill authorized the appropriation for the fiscal year 1966 of \$70 million to carry out title III. The Senate amendment authorized the appropriation for such year of \$55 million for such purpose. The conference substitute adopts the Senate figure.

The House bill authorized the appropriation for the fiscal year 1966 of \$300 million to carry out title V. The Senate amendment authorized the appropriation for such year of \$150 million for such purpose. The conference report contains the Senate figure.

The House bill authorized the appropriation for the fiscal year 1966 of \$20 million to carry out title VI. The Senate amendment authorized the appropriation for such year of \$30 million for such purpose. The substitute agreed upon in conference adopts the Senate figure.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] without losing the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INDIA-PAKISTAN: ANOTHER UNITED NATIONS SUCCESS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, it has been a long, dry 1965 for the United Nations. The U.N. has been unable to contribute significantly to peace in Vietnam. The U.N. Assembly has been unable even to cast a substantive vote.

But now, thanks to the great skill of the Johnson administration, the forbearing cooperation of the Soviet Union, and the quiet but vigorous efforts of the United Kingdom and others, the

September 24, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

24197

United Nations has achieved what appears to be a 10-strike for peace in successfully winning a cease-fire between India and Pakistan.

The war between these two major non-Communist countries of Asia was not only developing into the tragedy of violence and death that characterizes all war, but also threatened to collapse the major bastions of freedom in Asia, with Red China picking up the pieces.

A few days ago, it seemed impossible for the U.N. or any other force to call India or Pakistan back from this religious war.

President Johnson should be especially singled out for commendation. It must have been tempting to step into this controversy as the peacemaker—as, indeed, he was urged to do by the belligerents. His credentials for this peace-directing role as the President of the principal source of economic aid for both countries, and the major supplier of arms for Pakistan, were mighty impressive.

But the President had the wisdom to restrain the Nation from the glory and the danger of such a role. He wisely recognized the part that the Soviet Union and the United Kingdom could and should play, and he especially perceived how very important this role could be and should be for the United Nations.

The success of the United Nations in serving as the agency that has brought a cease-fire in this war will serve mankind far better than a U.S. unilaterally enforced peace, even if we could have achieved it. This gives confidence to the United Nations and in the United Nations.

As the Washington Post put it in its headline yesterday, "U.N. Makes Peace in Its Finest Hour," the U.N. achievement can be a real harbinger of strength—along with the U.N. success in Korea, the Suez, Cyprus, the Congo, and elsewhere.

Americans should be proud that this Nation, under the leadership of President Johnson, made this U.N. success possible.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article published in the Washington Post, and written by Louis Fleming, to which I have referred, printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.N. MAKES PEACE IN ITS FINEST HOUR
(By Louis B. Fleming)

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y., September 22.—There was a glow of satisfaction and the return of a long-lost sense of confidence at the United Nations today following the early-morning agreement on a cease-fire between India and Pakistan.

The United Nations had made peace—and so had Arthur J. Goldberg. Corridors buzzed about both.

Only a handful of hearty diplomats had been on hand in the Council chamber at 3 a.m. to hear Pakistan Foreign Minister Zulfikar Ali Bhutto read the cease-fire agreement.

Only eight reporters had stood in the corridor an hour later to hear U.S. Ambassador Goldberg say: "This is a great moment in the history of the United Nations."

CLOSE SHAVE FOR PEACE

And only a few persons knew how close to disaster the path to peace had come in the tense hours between 1:45 a.m. Monday, when the Council demanded a cease-fire, and 3 a.m. Wednesday, when Bhutto agreed.

There was almost universal agreement among diplomats that this was the Security Council's finest hour. The threat of this war, with the backstage role of Communist China, had an importance that most thought greater than earlier Council peace actions.

Most of the delegates agreed that much of the credit belonged to Goldberg, even though he had risked a mutiny by some of the members, and even though the final agreement was threatened by a walkout of some of the same angry members early today.

Goldberg himself was convinced that the agreement early Monday morning was the fruit of continuous negotiations he had demanded as Council president.

SIX THREATENED TO QUIT

At the crucial moment in these negotiations Monday, the six nonpermanent members of the Council handed Goldberg a letter threatening to walk out and challenging his extended talks alone with France, the Soviet Union and Britain while they cooled their heels outside. Fortunately, he had just won agreement from the Big Four on a resolution almost identical to one he had negotiated earlier in the day with the six.

Their mutiny was abandoned and the Council adopted the resolution.

Council members themselves were kept in a state of suspense by Pakistan until Bhutto read the agreement of his government at the exact hour set for the ceasefire in the Council's Monday resolution.

At 2:36 a.m. Goldberg invited Bhutto to address the Council. At this point, no one on the Council yet knew what the Pakistani would do.

BITTER CHARGES

For 20 minutes, the Foreign Minister gave a traditional Kashmir dispute speech, ringing oratory, bitter charges against India, protests of absolute innocence on the part of Pakistan, a threat to fight for 1,000 years if necessary to defend the right of self-determination for the people of Kashmir.

But he kept looking at the clock. Just at 3 a.m., the hour of the cease-fire deadline, he halted his speech, pulled out a piece of paper, and carefully read the following message from Pakistani President Ayub Khan: "Pakistan considers Security Council Resolution 211 of September 20 as unsatisfactory. However, in the interest of international peace and in order to enable the Security Council to evolve a self-executing procedure which will lead to an honorable settlement of the root cause of the present conflict; namely, the Jammu and Kashmir dispute, I have issued the following order to the Pakistan armed forces * * *"

Pakistan would stop shooting in 5 minutes, he informed the Council.

Council members recessed to draft their acceptance. The final cease-fire deadline was postponed for 15 hours to give both armies time for implementation.

Elation over the peace agreement was tempered with a realization that, as Goldberg said, the cease-fire was just the beginning. Pakistan obviously was dead serious when it said it would quit the United Nations if the Council allows the question of Kashmir to drift as it has for 16 years.

But it was impossible to exaggerate the achievement in terms of revived prestige for the organization. It was a credit to Secretary General U Thant, whose 9-day peace mission to India and Pakistan laid the foundation for the cease-fire agreement.

And, for the Council, it was a moment particularly significant for the unity of the

big four that succeeded in isolating the conflict from the opportunism of Peking.

(The U.N. General Assembly's steering committee recommended—without taking a formal vote—that the Assembly again take up the issue of a seat for Red China, Associated Press reported. U.S. Ambassador Charles Y. Vost said the United States had no objection to full-scale Assembly debate, but added that in the light of recent events he believed the debate "would serve no useful purposes." The steering committee also overrode Communist objections and recommended that the Assembly again take up the Tibet issue.)

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] for so graciously yielding to me.

Mr. CLARK. I commend the Senator from Wisconsin for the comments he has just made. I invite his attention to what I hope is the beginning of a real peace offensive, as the result of our success in bringing about a cease-fire between India and Pakistan.

This peace offensive got underway 2 weeks ago at the Washington World Conference on "World Peace Through World Law," which was addressed by the President of the United States, the Chief Justice of the United States, and by Ambassador Arthur Goldberg who, by the way, is reported in the press this morning as having delivered an excellent speech at the United Nations in connection with the cease-fire between India and Pakistan in which he also indicated his intention to support the views of President Johnson that we should now get going on a peace offensive which would include a number of measures on disarmament.

Mr. President, I hope to have something to say about that later in the day. I commend my friend the Senator from Wisconsin for his activity in this regard.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Let me say to the Senator from Pennsylvania that I agree with him wholeheartedly in his remarks. I also invite attention once again to the brilliant speech made at that conference by the Senator from Pennsylvania, on arms control and disarmament. I thought so highly of it that I inserted it in the RECORD. I thought it was a great contribution to the peace offensive to which he has referred.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, September 23, 1965, was dispensed with.

AUTHORIZATION TO RECEIVE MESSAGES AND SIGN BILLS DURING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to receive messages, and that the Vice President be authorized to sign bills and resolutions during the adjournment of the Senate, which is anticipated until next Tuesday, September 28, 1965.

24198

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

September 24, 1965

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MUSKIE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request by Mr. CLARK, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

FOREIGN STEEL FLOWS INTO UNITED STATES AT NEW HIGH RATE, 16 TONS A MINUTE

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, as everyone knows, coal—coke—is essential to the production of steel.

Recently the American Iron and Steel Institute put out a statement showing that foreign steel now flows into the United States at the new high rate of 16 tons a minute.

Nevertheless, according to the Nathan Report, West Germany, the Netherlands, France, and in this case the United Kingdom, have almost prohibitive quantitative restrictions, quotas, licensing arrangements, and so forth, on the imports of coal.

According to this report, these non-tariff barriers cost the United States up to \$500 million a year on coal alone.

I believe it just and proper that we ask for more economic cooperation from our friends and allies of the free world. We are all in this one together.

I ask unanimous consent that the article in question be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOREIGN STEEL FLOWS INTO UNITED STATES AT NEW HIGH RATE, 16 TONS A MINUTE

Foreign steel mill products entered the United States at the rate of 16 tons per minute during the first 4 months of 1965. That record was set despite the January-February dock strike on the east and gulf coasts.

In comparison, imports averaged a little less than 11 tons per minute during the same 4 months of 1964 and about 12 tons per minute for the full year. A decade ago, the rate was less than 2 tons per minute.

Within the general increase in steel mill product imports which, at current rates, could bring the 1965 total to almost 8 million tons, significant changes are in progress.

Prior to 1959—the year in which this country became a net importer of steel for the first time in half a century—sheets and strip comprised a negligible item in the total import picture. For example, in 1955, sheets and strip brought in from foreign countries came to a little more than 54,000 tons, or 5.5 percent of the 973,000-ton total. The United States was then, as it is now, the world's largest producer of sheets and strip.

In the steel strike year of 1959 when many domestic steel consumers had to turn abroad for supplies to keep their factories running, sheet and strip imports jumped to over 8 percent of total imports, or 388,000 tons. During 1964 the tonnage of sheets and strip brought into this country from foreign sources increased to almost 1.2 million tons which was 18 percent of total imports.

Through the first 4 months of this year, sheets and strip accounted for 28 percent of all imported mill products—766,000 out of 2,732,000 net tons.

JAPANESE MAKE BIG GAIN

Among the foreign sources of imported steel mill products, Japan has shown the most remarkable gain. During 1955, the 96,000 tons of imports originating in that country accounted for a little less than 10 percent of the total. By 1959, the tonnage had increased to 626,000 net tons (14 percent) and Japanese products have accounted for a larger percentage of total imports in each year since then. In 1964, imports of 2,446,000 tons from Japan represented 38 percent of the total.

Through the first quarter of this year, imports from Japan accounted for nearly 44 percent of all steel mill products entering the United States, and that country is by far the largest single source of sheets and strip.

All sections of the country are affected by the inroads of foreign steel into the domestic economy, as shown below.

Particularly noteworthy among the data shown is the high rank of Japan as a source of steel mill products at the end of such long shipping routes as the Atlantic and gulf coasts and even in customs districts along the "north coast" created by the St. Lawrence Seaway.

In that latter connection, the Michigan customs district (with Detroit primary) ranked third in tonnage of foreign steel received last year—exceeded only by Los Angeles and Galveston districts. New York and New Orleans were the next largest, followed by Chicago.

Together, the great industrial centers in the vicinity of Detroit and Chicago were the targets of more than a million tons of foreign steel last year. Buffalo received 306,000 tons.

OUR UNFAVORABLE BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, everyone is becoming interested in the problem of our continuing unfavorable balance of payments, and its relationship to liquidity in the promotion of world trade.

In this connection, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the Kansas City Star, entitled, "Secretary Scores Points for Monetary Reform," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECRETARY SCORES POINTS FOR MONETARY REFORM

Henry H. Fowler, Secretary of the Treasury and traveler, returned from Europe with a fever and a reasonably optimistic report on the prospects for reform in the international monetary system. Armed with proof that the United States is successfully grappling with its own balance-of-payments problem, and bolstered by the momentum of the U.S. initiative, Fowler has obtained agreement from the major nations to get the show on the road. Presumably this will be done at conversations which will begin in October. We are sorry about the fever but we must say that the Secretary turned in a fine piece of work.

In the simplest of terms, the immediate problem—and by immediate, we do not mean tomorrow or the day after, but within the decade to come—stems in part from the U.S. success in bringing its payments balance into line in the second quarter of the year. But the dollars that constituted the American deficit for so many years were the chief fountain of international liquidity. That simply means that dollars dispatched overseas for various purposes were used to finance world development. Not just dollars, of course; but mostly dollars.

It is obvious that the United States does not intend to—and cannot afford to—let its payments balance get so badly out of line for such a prolonged period. Thus there will be fewer dollars to go around. Moreover, with the expansion of the various national economies and with the rapid growth of the population, there is a need for more funds to assure orderly growth. The question is thus proposed: Where are the funds to come from?

This is the crux of the issue at the moment when Fowler can report that the so-called group of 10—the United States, Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Great Britain, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, and Sweden—will begin negotiations next month. These will be preliminary in nature. And Fowler has been extremely careful in assuring the underdeveloped nations that the intention is not to create a rich man's club to take charge of reform. Rather, all the members of the International Monetary Fund will be considered and in due time will be consulted. This must be so even though only a few nations—in all probability the group of 10 itself—will provide the bulk of the funds to be used in any monetary reform. That is the way it must be. Nevertheless, the industrial nations have a large stake in the development of the new and poor nations, and the interest of those nations must be considered.

It thus is a matter of extreme delicacy, involving the intricacies of international finance and the pride of nations. Fowler, as we see it, has so far handled the matter masterfully. And the talks that begin next month could be the opening of a genuine monetary reform that would give new stability to the entire free world.

EUGENE ZUCKERT, SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, some of us plan to pay our respects and tribute to one of the great public servants of our time, Secretary of the Air Force, Eugene M. Zuckert, who is retiring next week.

We planned to do so next Monday, but inasmuch as I understand the Senate will not be in session on that day, I should like all Senators to know that immediately after the morning hour on Wednesday, September 29, it is our intention to pay tribute to Mr. Zuckert.

I thank my friend the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], for his typical courtesy in yielding to me.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is most welcome.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMEND- MENTS OF 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8283) to expand the war on poverty.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I address myself to the conference report on the Economic Opportunity Act amendments of 1965.

The Senate version of this act added in section 205(a), "family planning," which is illustrative of the programs which the Director is authorized to make grants to, or to contract for with local public or private nonprofit agencies. This addition to the major programs initially authorized by the act was in-

September 29, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A5501

General in his news release saw fit to quote 1959 voter figures for Bolivar County. The Mississippi Legislature passed a simplified voter form about June 28, 1965. This form is as simple or is simpler than the laws of 20 other States.

Since that date 1,763 people have registered to vote in Bolivar County. In a period of less than 90 days the voter registration has increased by more than 25 percent and the overwhelming majority of these 1,763 people are Negroes. Mound Bayou has increased its registration by 223 since that date. The East and East Cleveland, a predominantly Negro precinct, has increased by 832. Mr. Katzenbach has the reputation of being a fair and honorable man. We believe that if these facts are brought to his attention he will rescind his previous order to send registrars to Bolivar County. The people of Mississippi adopted the simple voter form by 3 to 1. The vote in Bolivar County was 7 to 1. We have made an honest effort to do the right thing. The Attorney General's announcement, in view of our attitude and our past action of no discrimination, astounded us because of its gross unfairness. We are calling upon you as our elected people in Washington to take our case to the President and to Mr. Katzenbach and urge that this unjust order be rescinded. And we request that you inform us as to the action taken.

C. W. Capps, Jr., H. B. Boykin, G. D. Criss, I. Myers, Milton Smith, Danna C. Moore, Wm. B. Alexander, Max Dillworth, Elmer Prewitt, Alfred Welshans, O. J. Scott, Walter Sillers, J. A. Thigpen, E. H. Green.

The Real Alabama—Part LXVII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 29, 1965

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, many cities in Alabama have undergone basic economic changes in recent years as conditions change to require new enterprise and development. In many cases great diversification has been the result, bringing with it a broad economic base.

One example of this is the city of Jasper. The story of Jasper has been told in an article appearing in the Birmingham News, and I include the text of that article here:

Jasper, Ala., was thrown deep into economic depression in the early 1950's when the coal market collapsed. Through determination, initiative, and confidence the city bounced back to realize a versatile industrial complex, and a solid economy.

And Jasper, county seat of Walker County in northwest Alabama, is not about to rest on this. The city and county are on the march to attract more industry.

Now thriving with a population of 13,636, Jasper doesn't find it difficult to remember the dark days of the 1950's when they saw 8,000 county coal miners lose their jobs overnight.

"Up until 1950," Doug Leake, former chamber of commerce president explains, "this county was mainly dependent on coal. The sudden decline in the market gave Walker County its own private depression."

Leake said the citizens endeavored to find other industries to replace coal and with an eye toward diversification.

Industry in Jasper today ranges from dress shirts to dressed chickens and from strip mining to mink food.

"We're not a one-engine town now," John Oliver, chamber vice president says, "We've got good diversification in industry and we've got everything needed for industry—railways, highways, water, and a good trading center."

Jasper has developed a 95-acre industrial park to attract more industry while advertising its most valuable resources—good plant sites, abundant timber, available labor, three railroads, water, river transportation, and community cooperation.

Jasper and other county communities speak with pride about their school system, their good hospitals and particular pride is taken in Walker College, a private, independent, and nondenominational 2-year liberal arts college. Established in 1938, the college now has a faculty of 25 with an enrollment of more than 400.

Strip mining is a major factor in the county economy but the adversity of the fifties really taught the people a lesson—don't put all those economy eggs in one basket.

Agricultural products, displayed every year in the Northwest Alabama Fair in Jasper, have grown from a \$5 million industry in 1954 to a total farm income of \$15,310,000 in 1963.

Poultry business zoomed from a small \$1,210,000 in 1954 to an income of \$11,500,000 in 1963.

A pet project currently underway is the development of Smith Lake as a recreational area. The huge body of fish-filled water has a shoreline of 500 miles and covers 21,000 acres.

"The development of Smith Lake will mean a tremendous amount of money for our community," Joe McCluney, chamber executive director says.

In A. R. Simmons, chamber president's view, "The diversification in Jasper and Walker County since the coal mine recession is a monument to the determination and initiative of the people."

Simmons also paid tribute to the confidence of the companies and organizations "both local and foreign who brought many jobs to our county." He sees the area as an ideal geographical location for industry "with a healthy and mature labor atmosphere and a population determined to help itself."

Human Investment Act of 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 29, 1965

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill today which I believe to be a sound approach to an aspect of the Nation's continuing problem of unemployment and job retraining. It is known as the Human Investment Act of 1965. A number of my Republican colleagues, under the leadership of the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] have introduced similar bills.

The Human Investment Act would encourage private business both large and small to invest in upgrading the job skills of the Nation's labor force. It would accomplish this by providing a 7-percent tax credit to an employer toward certain of his employee training expenses. Among the expenses specifically

named are those relating to: apprenticeship training, on-the-job training under the Manpower Development and Training Act, cooperative work study programs, and tuition refund and organized group instruction payments by employers.

This would give an employer an incentive to expand his training programs and to initiate new programs for his employees. By participating in advanced training, an employee can improve his skills and thus improve his job security and earning ability. As those presently employed move up to better jobs through more training, those now unemployed because of insufficient skills can be hired to take their places. Also it would offer new hope to workers whose jobs are threatened by automation or by shifting defense contracts.

In passing the Manpower Development and Training Act, the Congress indicated its awareness of the need for meeting the increasingly serious problem of structural unemployment caused by a labor force ill fitted for existing and developing job opportunities. The Human Investment Act will link private enterprise efforts with those efforts being made by Federal and State governments in this important area. The major premise of the proposal which I am introducing is that private business has over the years learned how to obtain the most results per training dollar and should now be encouraged to expand its training programs to meet this national need.

It is my hope that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will examine seriously the merits of this legislation.

Whose Side Are We On?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 29, 1965

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, many of us have been, to say the least, a little confused about our foreign policy in regard to India and Pakistan.

Fortunately, Mr. Art Buchwald, writing in the Washington Post of September 23, 1965, has brilliantly clarified any confusion that might have existed.

I commend his article, which follows, to all Members of Congress and to the State Department:

"WHOSE SIDE ARE WE ON?"

(By Art Buchwald)

It is very important, the psychiatrists say, to answer your children's questions honestly and concisely no matter how difficult they become. I thought of this the other day while I was watching a news broadcast of the Indian-Pakistan war and my 11-year-old son with a machinegun in his hand asked, "What are they fighting about?"

"A place called Kashmir," I replied. "You see, the Indians have Kashmir now, but the Pakistanis claim the Kashmir people want to be a part of Pakistan because they're Moslem and not Hindu."

My son looked at me questioning. "Whose side are we on?"

A5502

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

September 29, 1965

"We're not on either side. We have a treaty with Pakistan and we supplied her with most of the planes and arms that she is using against India. At the same time we supplied India with arms and planes, but we didn't think they'd use them to fight each other."

"What did we think?"

"We thought they'd use them to fight the Communists."

"Why don't they fight the Communists?"

"It's not that simple," I said, slightly annoyed. "The Chinese Communists are supporting Pakistan and the Russian Communists seem to be supporting India. We would probably be more sympathetic toward the Pakistanis, except that the Chinese Communists are threatening to invade India."

"Without confusing you," I continued, "our main problem is: do we send military aid to India to repulse the Chinese Communists or not?"

He seemed to enjoy seeing me perspire.

"Why is it a problem?" he wanted to know.

"Because if we help the Indians against the Red Chinese, the Indians might turn around and use the equipment on the Pakistanis and prolong the war between India and Pakistan."

This seemed to satisfy him and I relaxed. But he was just digesting the material. Finally he said, "What is the solution?"

I grabbed the sides of the chair. "The solution is to take the war to the United Nations and let them solve it."

"But if we go to the United Nations, won't the Russians vote against us?"

"No, on this issue the Russians will vote with us. They're against us in Vietnam but not in India."

"Why not?"

"Because the Russians are as worried about the Red Chinese as we are."

"I don't understand. Aren't they both Communists?"

"Yes," I said, "but the Chinese Communists are more communistic than the Russian Communists. We can live with Russian communism but we can't live with Chinese communism, unless, of course, the Russians start pushing us around again in Cuba."

"Then should we like the Russians?"

"As far as India is concerned, yes. But we don't have to like them in Vietnam."

"Would we fight with the Russians against China if they attacked India?"

"It's possible. At the same time the Russians would probably fight with the Chinese if we attacked China."

"I don't get it," he said as he aimed a machinegun at Walter Cronkite who was at that moment on the TV screen.

"I don't see how I could make it simpler. Any child could understand it."

stay on the employer payroll for at least 3 months after finishing training.

This would meet the problem that many Government programs have run into—finding jobs for newly trained workers. Apprentices could be trained for jobs where labor shortages are current.

Also, the bill would give an employer an incentive to expand his training programs and initiate new programs for employees. It is the kind of program all business, big or small, could utilize.

This tax credit approach places the responsibility for increased job training where it belongs—on the private enterprise system. This system is equipped to conduct job training more effectively, efficiently, and economically than is the Government. It also offers new hope to workers whose jobs are threatened by automation.

Mr. Speaker, there is ample justification for such a tax credit proposal. Gordie Neufeld, in an editorial which appeared in the September 16 issue of the Mountain Lake, Minn., Observer, reported that 2.2 million jobs were created in 1964 alone by private employers in a massive and realistic war on poverty. Mr. Neufeld's editorial provides much insight into the need for the kind of legislation I am introducing today, and I include it in full at this point in my remarks:

WAR ON POVERTY

(By Gordie Neufeld)

The Government's antipoverty program is coming in for much criticism. Charges against the program are common. So far, it is said, most of the benefits seem to have gone to a well-paid administrative bureaucracy—relatively few to the poor.

Meanwhile, private employers are creating millions of jobs in a "poverty war" of their own. About 6 million of these jobs have come into existence in the last 5 years—2.2 million in 1964 alone. And, to quote a magazine article, "the private war on poverty has been particularly helpful to those Negroes, teenagers, and others, who were without education, skills, or experience."

Whatever the Government program may ultimately achieve, the most effective weapon against poverty is dynamic, expanding, socially conscious private enterprise.

Matching Skills to Jobs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 29, 1965

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call to my colleagues' attention an excellent editorial which was published in the September 27, 1965, edition of the Chicago Daily News.

The editorial discusses the Human Investment Act of 1965, a bill which more than 43 Members of the House introduced recently. I was pleased to join the gentleman from Missouri, Congressman Tom CURTIS, and Senator WINSTON PROUTY, of Vermont, in this significant effort.

Our bill proposes to complement the manpower training programs under Government supervision by offering a 7-percent tax credit to employers who train workers in new job skills. This is an approach to a specific problem which combines incentive and independence. It is an approach which, I am convinced, will work. It is an approach which will give private business an opportunity to contribute to its own well-being, as well as to the well-being of the Nation.

The Daily News editorial suggests that the administration may be considering supporting this bill. I welcome—and I am sure the cosponsors of this bill will welcome—any and all assistance which might be given to this important proposal. Though the bill has been sponsored up to this point solely by the representatives of one political party, the support of the other party would represent a fine victory for the best interests of the American people.

The editorial follows:

MATCHING SKILLS TO JOBS

The human investment bill, introduced in Congress by a group of Republicans of virtually all shades of party opinion, is a sound approach to one of the Nation's most nagging problems.

The problem is known as "structural unemployment" and was defined by Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS, Republican, of Missouri, in presenting the bill on the House floor:

"A large portion of our unemployment is not because of too few jobs, but because a large portion of our manpower is untrained in the skills that are actually at this moment in serious demand."

The proposed Human Investment Act would complement the manpower training programs under Government supervision by offering a 7-percent tax credit to employers who train workers in new job skills. The credit parallels the 7-percent allowance enacted 3 years ago to spur investment in machinery, plant, and equipment. The GOP position, CURTIS pointed out, is "that tax laws should treat humans as at least equal to machines."

The proposed act has several advantages over programs under direct Government control. It accomplishes an important objective without the waste of collecting tax money and then disbursing it, and without the increase in Federal control inherent in other programs.

It stipulates that a successful trainee must be offered a job and that no tax credit will be allowed for the training of management, professional, or advanced scientific employees. The emphasis is thus placed on new and better jobs for those at the bottom of the skills and income ladder.

By encouraging private industry's role in retraining, the bill involves the people who know best what skills are needed and how to get the greatest results for the money.

There is talk in Washington that the virtues of this approach are so apparent the Johnson administration is thinking of taking over the bill, in some amended version, and perhaps eventually portraying it to the public as a Democratic achievement in the war on poverty.

This would be no new experience for CURTIS. As a ranking GOP economic ideaman, he was chairman of a 48-member subcommittee of the Republican policy committee that studied unemployment in 1961 and issued a germinal report stressing the fact of "structural unemployment" and the need for job retraining. Much of this Republican spadework went into the Manpower Develop-

A Sound Way To Combat Unemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 29, 1965

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation designed to give private industry a 7-percent income tax credit for providing employees with needed job training or to improve their skills. This proposal is advisedly known as the Human Investment Act.

Under its terms, a tax credit would apply to wages of apprentices plus the cost of classroom instruction paid for by employers. Trainees would have to

September 22, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

23845

traditional system is too entrenched. At Eisenhower College, three trimesters per year will be the standard.

4. An outstanding teaching faculty: College teachers are in short supply. The best college teachers are far too few. Eisenhower College intends to be one of the places to which they gravitate. (Keen interest has already been expressed by established teachers in leading institutions across the country.) Elements which produce this gravitational pull include an academic environment which is stimulating to the keenest mind; a challenge to teach well, but with opportunity for research, publication, study and travel; a sound, but unbiased, Christian outlook; an academic calendar so constructed as to provide refresher breaks three times each year and a regular 4-month leave every 3 years; a curriculum trimmed of frills and irrelevancies so that concentration may be centered on essentials; salaries competitive from the very beginning with the wealthiest colleges; the stimulus of a new program, a share in the direction of educational policies; and such fringe attractions as residence in an attractive region near metropolitan centers.

5. A broad range of student opportunity: Whatever the background of circumstances and pre-college achievement—it is the promise of the applicant that will determine his admission to Eisenhower College. A common false index of "excellence" has been the limitation of admissions to students in the top 10 percent or even 5 percent of their high school classes. This excludes many talents of significant promise. Under these standards, many of the most distinguished graduates of our ivy-covered institutions could not gain admission to those same colleges today.

Admission to Eisenhower College will represent not solely a reward for past performance, but also a challenge for the future. Potential motivation will count heavily in the balance of qualifications. Eisenhower College believes that students of promise are distributed widely throughout at least the top 40 percent of high school achievers and not confined to the top 10 percent. Therefore, while maintaining unrelentingly high standards, its doors will be open to a much broader range of promise than is usual.

6. An efficient college plant: Education often suffers in quality because of an inadequate, poorly planned, wasteful plant. At Eisenhower College, the plant will be planned from the start, and in its entirety, to serve the highest intellectual uses. Kinds of buildings, size, arrangement and location will all be designed as integral parts of the educational program itself. Administrative, academic and living quarters will be interrelated for maximum use and impact. The plant, like the curriculum, will be designed to serve as a demonstration model. Preliminary architectural studies are proceeding, and it is Eisenhower College's uncompromising aim to bring the leading architectural insights to the service of its high academic goals.

These are the six outstanding features of quality at Eisenhower College: World outlook, select curriculum, year-round operation, an outstanding teaching faculty, a broad range of student opportunity, and an efficient college plant.

Certain of these, alone, might make Eisenhower College a noteworthy undertaking. Added together, they form a truly unique profile, significant for the future of higher education, with a real potential for greatness.

APPOINTMENT OF ELMER HOEHN AS HEAD OF OIL IMPORT PROGRAM: AN INSULT TO AMERICAN CONSUMERS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, at 9:30 this morning, Mr. Elmer Hoehn was sworn in as head of the Oil Import Administration.

If the administration tried to find a man who would be least likely to protect the interests of the millions of American consumers of oil, it could not have done worse.

Mr. Hoehn was executive secretary of the Independent Oil Producers & Land Owners Association, Tristate. This organization represents producers in Indiana, Illinois, and Kentucky.

It has played an active role in advocating the cutting of imports proposed by the Independent Petroleum Association of America.

As Oil Import Administrator, Hoehn will have the top responsibility for adjusting imports of petroleum and petroleum products in the United States in accordance with the Presidential proclamation of March 10, 1959. Hoehn will run this operation under the Secretary of the Interior.

The 1959 Presidential proclamation in the interest of national security imposes restrictions on the importation of crude oil, unfinished oil and finished petroleum products.

As Administrator Hoehn will allocate imports of oil among qualified applicants. He will issue import licenses on the basis of such allocations.

Thus, a man who had been hired to represent the oil interests fighting quotas will now sit in the driver's seat to determine how big those quotas will be.

It would be difficult to imagine a more unethical betrayal of the consumers' interests, or a more deliberate insult to the American oil consumer.

Elmer Hoehn is the same man reported by Oil Daily as active in discussions with the Democratic Platform Committee last Fall regarding depletion and oil imports.

Hoehn appears to have proved his effectiveness to the oil industry then.

The 1960 Democratic platform had denounced depletion as a conspicuous loophole that is inequitable. But the 1964 platform—showing the influence of Hoehn—does not mention this most notorious of oil tax loopholes.

UNITED STATES HANDLING OF INDIA-PAKISTAN WAR EXCELLENT TO DATE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, there is always a carload of brickbats thrown at the administration when anything goes wrong with our foreign policy. In the kind of world in which we live, with America as the unquestioned leader of the free world and the pre-eminent

military force in the world, this Nation—and specifically the President of this Nation—is blamed for almost everything that happens throughout the world. The India-Pakistan war is no exception.

Thoughtful and careful observers now are coming to agree that the way the President and Secretary of State have handled the India-Pakistan war has won very high marks for professional competence.

Of course, we can never be sure what is going to happen tomorrow or an hour from now, but at present it appears that the quiet, steady, but powerful, influence of this Nation may be the big element in winning a peaceful resolution of the tragic India-Pakistan clash.

In the course of this development, the rough and ready willingness of China to exploit the war has been met by the Johnson administration quietly but very effectively indeed. The consequence for our position in Vietnam as well as elsewhere in Asia, and indeed in the world, has been all to the good.

One of the most thoughtful and perceptive appraisals of this American foreign policy success, an analysis by Joseph Kraft, appeared in this morning's Washington Post. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PEACEMAKING IN ASIA

(By Joseph Kraft)

Victory a la Hitler and Napoleon, victory that means seized capitals and subdued countries, is not in the cards in the Indian subcontinent. Given the terrain, the size of the forces, and the state of the local art, the worst likely military trouble is intensified fighting ending in the kind of non-end that has characterized almost all frontier struggles in the postwar era.

But there is a serious diplomatic danger that could materialize within a month. It would be possible for Russia to emerge from the present troubles as the dominant diplomatic power in India. China could emerge as the dominant diplomatic power in Pakistan. It is against that awful outcome that American diplomacy must be mobilized.

So far it can be said that the administration has met the test with remarkable sophistication. It has shown a clear appreciation of what has been going on. It has scrupulously avoided panicky reactions and unilateral moves that could only make matters worse. It has even avoided that fatal combination that has been the hallmark of American diplomacy through the decades—the combination of force and unctuous rectitude.

On one side, the Indian side, of the quarrel, this country has for once resisted the temptation to indulge in an orgy of China-baiting. Unlike the Pakistanis, Indians and Russians who have all been doing the kind of things that make the Chinese look 10 feet tall, the United States has been patient and moderate.

The strongest official statement about Chinese intervention made by the United States was a remark made last week by the Secretary of State after giving testimony to

23846

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

September 22, 1965

the Congress. Because it produced banner headlines of an American warning to Peiping, the statement is worth reproducing in full.

Mr. Rusk was asked about charges that Communist China has been "egging on" the fight on the subcontinent. In a reply of studied mildness, he said: "I think there are those who feel that China is trying to fish in troubled waters here. Our own advice to Peiping would be not to do that and to stay out of it and give the Security Council of the United Nations a chance to settle this matter."

On the other side of the quarrel, the Pakistani side, this country has resisted the itch to make moral judgments about the Kashmir issue. Instead of trying, as the Pakistanis put it, to solve the problem rather than the symptoms, Washington has kept its righteousness under firm control. The closest this country has come to a pronouncement on Kashmir was again the comment made by the Secretary of State after testimony on the Hill last week.

His words were remarkable for measured care. And once again, because they were widely misinterpreted, they are worth citing.

Mr. Rusk was asked about a plebiscite that would achieve self-determination on Kashmir. He said: "We have expressed our views on that subject over the years. That is part of a general problem of solution of outstanding issues between India and Pakistan. We believe that these matters should be taken up and resolved by peaceful means. We do not believe they should be resolved by force."

With this country keeping its tone measured, the Russians and Chinese, far from scoring great gains as the beaky hawks would assert, have overreached themselves. The Chinese, fearful that a settlement of sorts might be in the works, issued their ultimatums in the evident hope of preventing Pakistan from coming to terms. Lacking the capacity for truly serious action on the ground, they have been obliged to extend the ultimatum. It is now not easy to see how they will emerge without a simultaneous loss of prestige, and a new confirmation of their role as chief international troublemaker.

For their part, the Russians, after issuing the kind of warnings bound to incite Peiping, have pulled the grandstand play of calling for a meeting of Indian and Pakistani representatives in Moscow. If it comes off at all, which is extremely doubtful, it is hard to see how a Moscow meeting can yield concrete results. Far from making the most of an opportunity, the Russians seem merely to be underlining their own limitations. They may end up with egg all over their face.

The lesson here is not simply Milton's homily that "they also serve who only stand and wait"; that, after all, was an ode to blindness. The true lesson, the lesson for those who would see in the dark, is that in this country's contacts with the Chinese Communists, the bellicose reaction is almost always the wrong reaction. The right policy is to turn to account against the Chinese the miasmic political swamps that fringe the Asian heartland. And nowhere is that more true than in that other Asian trouble spot that we all know in our bones is dimly related to the crisis in the subcontinent—Vietnam.

THE DOMINICAN CRISIS

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, in recent weeks I have tried to read all testimony available regarding the situation in the Dominican Republic last spring. Having heard the discussion in the Senate in the course of the debate regarding the judgment, or lack of judgment, of our Ambassador to the Dominican Republic, Mr. Bennett, Jr., I have reached my own conclusion that the

greater weight of the evidence justifies the conclusion that the recent statement of Chairman J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, was corroborated and sound.

It is to be noted that following the time Ambassador W. Tapley Bennett, Jr., made his frantic call to the White House pleading for the immediate sending in of American marines to save American lives, his plea was immediately complied with. Instead of a few thousand marines being sent in to maintain order and save the lives of American civilians, allegedly in danger according to Ambassador Bennett, more than 30,000 men of our Armed Forces were sent in. This would seem almost enough to sink that little island.

I said on May 12, and I consider it a sound statement, that the threat of a Communist takeover was misrepresented and exaggerated. A theatrical touch was added with the statement that our Ambassador, Mr. Bennett, was making his plea from beneath his desk while our Embassy was being fired on. Of course our President is not to be blamed for relying upon the statements of his Ambassador.

It is noteworthy that not one American civilian was killed or wounded in the fighting that took place either before or after Ambassador Bennett made the frantic plea for help. Unfortunately there was fighting between the forces of the military junta and those who were referred to as rebels. The first American killed was a marine who was accidentally shot by a fellow marine.

It is noteworthy also that practically all dispatches made public by our State Department and by our President following the initial plea of Ambassador Bennett, Jr. referred to U.S. Ambassadors Martin or Bunker. Ambassador Bunker had apparently taken over. Fortunately, the leader of the junta, Wessin y Wessin, has recently been deported from that unhappy island and is now voicing his complaints from the safety of Florida. Disorder and rioting have ceased, civil authority has been restored. This is all to the good. I am hopeful that free elections in the Dominican Republic will be held as promised.

It is an unfortunate fact that we have in our State Department some officials who seem to denounce as Communists Latin American leaders who take action in opposition to the wealthy economic royalists of any Latin American country. I observed this firsthand while with a factfinding study group in South America for some weeks. Personally, I consider that W. Tapley Bennett, Jr. is one who indicated sympathy for and agreement with leaders of the Dominican junta, and considered the democratic elements and supporters of Juan Bosch as infiltrated or controlled by Communists. There was no justification for that conclusion.

Dr. Juan Bosch, during his 7-month administration as elected president of the Dominican Republic, commenced to give that little island and its people their first experience in democratic government instead of tyranny. He was ousted by a military junta aided by one of the

assassins of the despot Trujillo. In Brazil, Venezuela, Chile and other Latin American countries there are those leaders who are seeking to release the people from the stranglehold of absentee landlordism and to break up huge estates and distribute a part of their huge landholdings to the impoverished, underprivileged laborers and peasants and free them from misery and squalor. Even though such expropriation proceedings are proposed by legal action, it appears that some of our Ambassadors to Latin American countries have in the past almost automatically regarded such leaders as Communists or Communist sympathizers. On the basis of evidence I have read, I believe there is clear and convincing proof that Ambassador Bennett, Jr., failed to distinguish between truly democratic elements in the citizenry and the Communist elements. He showed prejudice in favor of the military junta and against democratic elements of the Dominican Republic.

I am convinced that the views of Chairman FULBRIGHT, that the rebel forces were not controlled by Communist elements, are correct. I am convinced that Ambassador Bennett's conclusions lacked justification. Furthermore, as an indication that Chairman FULBRIGHT's conclusions have basis in fact, it is well known that almost immediately our President dispatched as special envoy John Bartlow Martin and a little later Ellsworth Bunker, to take over in the Dominican Republic. Following that time, order was restored. Citizens of the Dominican Republic seem to have confidence in Ambassador's Martin and Bunker when many had apparently lacked confidence in Ambassador W. Tapley Bennett, Jr. It is evident that our President felt the same way.

Mr. President, it seems to me irrefutable that our President's reliance, directly after the start of the rioting and the sending in of Marines responding to the plea of Ambassador W. Tapley Bennett, Jr., upon John Bartlow Martin and Ellsworth Bunker and apparent disregard of Bennett, Jr., is further verification of the soundness of Chairman FULBRIGHT's conclusions. In my opinion our colleague, Chairman FULBRIGHT, had the greater weight of the evidence in support of his conclusions.

Certainly the Dominican Republic is within our sphere of influence in the Western Hemisphere. We cannot tolerate any Communist takeover of authority in that little island and I assert there was no evidence of any Castro-like takeover. No Communist was a leader in the revolt. In my judgment there was no preponderance of the evidence available or adduced that such a Communist takeover was even remotely in prospect.

Dan Kurzman, staff writer of the Washington Post, reported that Col. Francisco Caamaño Deno of the so-called rebel forces stated that Ambassador Bennett laughed at him when he asked the Ambassador's help to end the bloodshed. Colonel Caamaño stated he was ready to agree to a cease-fire and to negotiate with the military junta but that Ambassador Bennett refused to mediate and laughed scornfully at him. It is to be

September 22, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

23843

distinguished colleague from the State of Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] introduced S. 2127, in order to provide special indemnity insurance for members of the Armed Forces serving in combat zones. I was indeed happy to cosponsor this legislation with him. It was also cosponsored by the very able and distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

On August 19 the Senate unanimously passed this measure, and it was referred to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs in the House of Representatives.

After the Committee on Veterans' Affairs made improvements in the legislation sponsored by Senator TALMADGE, Senator WILLIAMS and myself, the House unanimously passed this legislation.

As it is true in the legislative process of the Congress each body makes improvements in legislation before it is finally enacted.

I would like to compliment the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House [Mr. TEAGUE] and the members of his committee, for doing a remarkable job in further improving this legislation so that today we have before us a bill to provide needed protection for those serving in our Armed Forces.

In discussing the improvements and changes made by the House of Representatives with Senator TALMADGE and Senator WILLIAMS, I urge my colleagues to accept the House amendments and send the measure forthwith to the President hopefully for his approval.

The bill as presently before us provides a group life insurance plan for all members of the uniformed services on active duty on and after the effective date designated by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

Coverage is automatic with the serviceman being required to take affirmative action to remove himself from the program.

The coverage provided is \$10,000 or \$5,000. Premium rates for the servicemen are expected to be \$2 a month for the \$10,000 policy and \$1 per month for the \$5,000 policy. These premiums would be deducted from the pay of the servicemen by the Department of Defense and remitted to the Veterans' Administration.

All costs traceable to extra hazards of servicemen will be borne by the Government, otherwise the program would be self-sustaining with the deductions that I have previously referred to.

Under the provisions of the measure, if an individual has a service-connected disability, he would be eligible for a commercial policy without medical examination, and in addition would be eligible for a \$10,000 disabled veterans' insurance policy administered by the Veterans' Administration. In the latter case he must apply for the policy within 1 year of the date of the establishment of the service-connected disability.

Another important improvement made in the bill as passed by the Senate provides for the period January 1, 1967, and continuing until the effective date of the group insurance plan a maximum death gratuity of \$5,000 to a widow, child or children and the parents of individuals

who served during this period in one of the branches of the Armed Services and who lost their lives under certain hazardous conditions as a result of such service.

This gratuity would be reduced by the amount of any dependency and indemnity compensation, National Service Life Insurance, or U.S. Government life insurance payable in the particular case.

I feel that this much-needed legislation warrants the prompt and final action by the Congress to provide for those in the Armed Forces who are making great sacrifices in defending this country's freedom as well as that of the free world.

Knowing that we care at home about the future welfare of our armed forces personnel and their dependents certainly would do much toward bolstering their spirits at times when many of us have a tendency to forget and take for granted the freedoms which we enjoy today as a result of the services they are rendering to our country.

I cannot urge too strongly that the Senate accept the House amendments and send the bill forthwith to the President for signature.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY of New York in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE].

The amendment to the House amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now recurs on concurring in the House amendment as amended.

The amendment of the House, as amended, was agreed to.

CEASE-FIRE IN THE INDO-PAKISTAN DISPUTE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the cease-fire which appears to have been achieved in the Indo-Pakistan dispute is an event of great magnitude for the orderly and peaceful management of international conflicts. It brings renewed hope in the efficacy of the United Nations Security Council as a major instrument for the maintenance of peace. To be sure, the basic problem of Kashmir remains to be resolved. To be sure, the cease-fire may not hold indefinitely. But neither factor detracts from the achievement. The cease-fire reflects, may I say, great credit both on India and Pakistan and on the policies of every government represented on the United Nations Security Council. It is the best possible response not only to the immediate fighting between India and Pakistan but to those who would fish in troubled waters.

On the part of the United States, I want to say, further, that President Johnson has guided our limited but significant part in this matter with policies of exceptional wisdom and great good sense.

In their cautious and restrained approach to this problem, the President, the Secretary of State, and our outstanding Ambassador at the United Nations, Mr. Arthur Goldberg, have made a highly significant contribution to the restoration of order in the Indo-Pakistan sub-

continent, to the forestalling of the rapid spread of chaos in Asia and to the general strengthening of the prospect for international action for peace through the United Nations Security Council.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I join with the Senator in expressing gratification over what has happened. It is especially significant because it again establishes the importance of the role of the United Nations, which seemed for the moment to have fallen into a state of desuetude because of its financial troubles.

We are all indebted to President Johnson and to United Nations Ambassador Arthur Goldberg for the part they played in avoidance of what could have led to the terrible conflagration of a war much broader than the conflict between India and Pakistan, and in the revival of the role of the United Nations in a most significant way.

I am grateful to the Senator from Montana for his comments.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I agree completely with the distinguished Senator from New York. Furthermore, I believe that the outcome of the difficulties between India and Pakistan indicates quite strongly the wisdom of the President's approach through the United Nations and, in effect, emphasizes that the idea of unilateral intervention on our part was not the correct procedure but, rather, that it was multilateral intervention, in a sense, through dependence on the Security Council of the United Nations, which, in this instance, I am informed, was unanimous in its outlook.

Mr. JAVITS. I am grateful to the Senator for his remarks.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I rise to commend the United Nations, Secretary General U Thant, President Johnson, the Soviet Union, Great Britain, and the many other nations who have participated in bringing about a cessation of the murderous hostilities between India and Pakistan.

This action illustrates the power of concerted effort by men and nations of good will. It also illustrates once again the vitality and urgent necessity for a world organization such as the United Nations. I commend that organization and the principle of collective security.

I applaud the existence of a world organization where debate and consultation among nations can occur—indeed, where debate even between nations engaging in hostilities on the battlefield can occur.

I also applaud the existence of a world organization in which the power of world opinion can be focused. Once again it seems to me that the success of the United Nations and the members thereof, in bringing about a cessation of hostilities, demonstrates the necessity and the urgency for the existence of such an organization.

DEDICATION OF EISENHOWER COLLEGE, SENECA FALLS, N.Y.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, yesterday, an event occurred in the State of New York which I believe deserves the attention of Congress. The first college

named after our former President, Dwight D. Eisenhower, was dedicated at Seneca Falls, N.Y., which lies in the center of the State, near beautiful Cayuga Lake, some 30 miles from Syracuse.

The college is headed by Dr. Earl J. McGrath, former Federal Commissioner of Education.

Speaking at the dedication were many distinguished leaders, including, of course, former President Eisenhower, and Governor Rockefeller, of our State.

I had planned to be there but was unable to do so because of the possibility of a vote on the immigration bill, which is of critical importance to my State, and the need for various negotiations in that respect.

Mr. President, the college is most enterprising. It is a voluntary college—an independent college, as it were. It will operate in a completely nonsectarian way. It proposes to pursue an accelerated year-round, trimester plan, giving unusual opportunities to its students. It will emphasize not only the liberal arts but also political science, and as we would expect world affairs.

Mr. President, I join with millions of other Americans in gratification over the fact that such a college has been initiated in the name of President Eisenhower and to wish for it—as I am sure will all Americans—a future of prosperity, success, and eminence in the field of higher education.

In this connection, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an Associated Press news story of the ground-breaking which appeared in today's Baltimore Sun, and an explanation of the college's purpose as contained in the booklet, "A College of Special Promise."

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun, Sept. 22, 1965]

PAUD LKE BREAKS GROUND FOR EISENHOWER COLLEGE

SENECA FALLS, N.Y., September 21.—Former President Dwight D. Eisenhower broke ground today for a college named after him and pronounced it an honor that "will be with me every day of my life."

Speaking at ceremonies on the site of Eisenhower College, the former Chief Executive said "the liberal arts college is the key to the understanding and exercise of real citizenship. I feel we must have more of them."

NO GREATER HONOR

Eisenhower College, scheduled to open in 1967, is to be a 4-year, liberal arts institution.

The one-time President told an estimated 12,000 persons gathered at the 265-acre site east of here, that he could think of no greater honor than having the college named for him.

"This honor that is accorded me will be with me every day of my life," he said.

The 74-year-old former Chief Executive said he disagreed with those who prophesied that small liberal arts colleges are a thing of the past. He said the liberal arts college should "seek its natural habitat in the rural areas. Let the big universities go to the cities."

He said such colleges would develop in the student moral standards and "a feeling of accommodation for understanding his fellow citizens."

President Johnson sent a telegram of congratulations praising officials who named the college in honor of "a man who has spent his lifetime in educational endeavor."

GREETED BY ROCKEFELLERS

Mr. Eisenhower flew here from his Gettysburg, Pa., farm and was greeted by Gov. and Mrs. Nelson A. Rockefeller.

He was introduced by his friend and occasional golfing companion, comedian Bob Hope. The former President laughed heartily in response to several quips by Hope.

"This is a great idea, this college," Hope said, adding:

"Our future Republicans have to come from some place. Where else but in America could a man in command of our armies, leader of our country, and a leader in the field of education, wind up in Seneca Falls shoveling dirt."

Dr. Earl J. McGrath, former U.S. Commissioner of Education, will serve as chancellor of Eisenhower College. The college, which overlooks Cayuga Lake, eventually will provide for an enrollment of about 1,500 students.

SIX SPECIAL EMPHASES

First, last, and always, the main objective of Eisenhower College will be high quality education. Lessons from the past will be applied; the mistakes avoided. In six main areas of policy and procedure, the focus will be on new contemporary keys for quality education.

1. World outlook: "The entire corporate life of Eisenhower College will reflect the fact that we live today in an international community in which provincial thought and behavior are as outmoded as Ptolemaic astronomy. The graduates of Eisenhower College will live in a world completely different from that of their grandfathers. Already they can travel to Cairo, Buenos Aires, or Tokyo more quickly than their forebears could travel from Seneca Falls to Albany; and when they arrive, they are confronted with a culture and a way of life arrestingly different from their own. On transoceanic television they see events in distant lands as rapidly as they happen.

"An American who knows little or nothing about the politics, economics, religion, industry, commerce, ambitions, and needs of other peoples has had an education which has failed to prepare him to live intelligently in the world of today and tomorrow."

So writes Dr. Earl McGrath. And he adds:

"Yet a recent report, entitled 'Undergraduate Education in Foreign Affairs,' reveals that few students in the 175 institutions studied understood the facts of international life. The causes of their ignorance and differences are doubtless many, but an analysis of college courses disclosed little real effort on the part of institutions to prepare students for the roles they will have to play as members of the international community.

"There were courses in international politics, economics and culture, but these were few and designed for the small percentage of students specializing in some aspect of international affairs. The author concluded that if all students were to gain an interest in, and understanding of, events and peoples in other parts of the world and our relations to them, all departments would have to be involved. Indeed the entire campus life should reflect the institution's concern with the world scene."

Eisenhower College will make international studies part of every student's curriculum. Under a program coordinated by a dean of world studies, there will be insistence on a foundation for all: on extracurricular influences working on all; on a world view which will find practical or philosophic expression in every department of the curriculum.

Many institutions have excellent courses on international relations; or on the history, literature and culture of certain other nations; or excellent programs of study in depth for some special geographic area. As a rule these are optional, or only for the future specialist. Only a limited proportion of most student bodies is touched by these studies. When change and improvement are sought, internal solidification is a hindrance and only limited extensions can be grafted on. But Eisenhower College starts new and unencumbered. Its potential for success is immensely advanced. The means for reaching its goal is built in from the start, not tacked onto something existing and different.

2. Select curriculum: "The achievement of the liberal arts purpose requires far fewer courses than are common today. With few exceptions liberal arts colleges have allowed the several departments to expand beyond any defensible limit. Studies of a number of curriculums in such institutions disclose broad arrays of instructions, sometimes nearly as many courses as students, much of which is so highly specialized and technical that it should be reserved for graduate departments or professional schools. This excessive proliferation usually results in a large percentage of small and expensive classes (sometimes over 40 percent of all courses enroll fewer than 10 students). These extravagances proportionately dissipate the efforts of the faculty, commensurately reduce their salaries, and make the student's education a collection of fragmentary and disjointed intellectual experiences."

Again so writes Dr. McGrath.

Eisenhower College will keep waste out of its curriculum from the start. It can do this successfully because it starts with a basic curriculum and has no vested faculty interests to combat. Eighteen academic departments (instead of the frequent 25 to 30) will offer fewer than 250 courses plus four interdisciplinary courses (instead of the usual 500-600 courses or more), totaling 840 credit hours (compared with the usual 1,500-2,000 hours).

From this select curriculum will come:

Greater concentration on liberal arts essentials;

Better teaching;

Fewer wasteful small classes;

Smaller faculty and higher salaries;

All leading to a better faculty and a spiral of increasing quality.

3. Year-round operation: Year-round operation will be brought about through use of the trimester plan. Each year will comprise three 14-week terms. Normally, therefore, the Eisenhower College student will complete his degree work in eight terms, or 2½ years, although exceptions will be made, of course, in cases of illness or other interruption.

This system of year-round operation embodies numerous advantages:

Gross annual income increase of 30 to 40 percent.

Combined with a smaller faculty as a result of reducing the curriculum to proper dimensions, this enables significantly higher salaries.

The college plant does not stand relatively idle for a quarter of the year.

The student's education is speeded. This is a growingly important consideration for the rapidly increasing numbers who are planning an additional 3 or 4 years of post-graduate or professional education. Also more than a year is added to the student's period of earning power.

Many colleges and universities have considered full-time year-round operation, and a few have introduced it in one form or another. Almost inevitably its advantages have not been fully realized since it represents a choice and not the norm, and because the

September 22, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

23803

To provide time for an objective study of the Sugar Act, the Congress would be wise to deal at this time only with stop-gap legislation needed to meet marketing problems of domestic producers, and leave the foreign quota problem to next year.

MONEY SPEAKS LOUDER THAN WORDS

(Mr. WIDNALL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, the old adage that "money speaks louder than words," may have been an important underlying factor in what appears to be a more reasonable attitude on the part of Pakistan and India in resolving their differences over Kashmir. Buried beneath this morning's headlines concerning a possible cease-fire, was an announcement by the World Bank that it had postponed indefinitely a meeting scheduled for tomorrow of nine Western nations that were supposed to pledge contributions to finance the first year of a new Pakistani 5-year plan for economic development.

The World Bank said the session could not be held at present because of the "abnormal conditions in the subcontinent. A meeting will be convened as soon as circumstances permit," a spokesman said.

Pakistan was seeking the equivalent of \$500 million for the first year of its third 5-year plan. Currently, World Bank economic assistance to India amounts to approximately \$1 billion per year.

As the ranking Minority Member of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, which has under its jurisdiction both the World Bank and the International Development Association, I want to take this opportunity to commend the World Bank for this timely action.

The threat to postpone massive economic assistance to recipient nations involved in costly wars can be a very real deterrent to those who threaten world peace. I would personally recommend that any and all World Bank meetings leading to new economic commitments be postponed until the Kashmir question is settled.

Moreover, under the antiaggression amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1963, the President has the authority to cutoff all unilateral U.S. economic aid to India and Pakistan at any time he deems desirable.

Mr. Speaker, the threat to cut off or postpone large-scale World Bank economic aid to these two countries may very well turn out to have been the single most important factor in bringing about a cease-fire.

AMERICA'S DWINDLING WATER SUPPLY

(Mr. REINECKE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, many Members have taken notice of America's

dwindling water supply. Various legislation has been passed this year, or is presently under consideration, which would assist in the alleviation of the water supply problem—on a long-range basis.

None of these proposals or programs will solve the problem next week or at any time in the immediate future.

Something must be done now—to alert the American public to the gravity of the situation and to point-out to all of our citizens various ways through which they, in their own homes and on their own jobs, can help their country in what is rapidly becoming a desperate situation.

For his reason, I am introducing today a joint resolution authorizing and requesting that the President designate November, as National Water Conservation Month in recognition of the importance of water conservation to the maintenance of public health and the national economy.

Mr. Speaker, I have notified the President of my proposal and I hope to have his support in this worthwhile endeavor. I hope also to have support of all Members of this House.

HUGH LAWSON WHITE

(Mr. WILLIAMS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, the people of Mississippi today mourn the loss of one of her most productive and illustrious sons. Hugh Lawson White, twice Governor of Mississippi, quietly passed away September 19, in Jackson, at the age of 84.

Governor White contributed to his fellow man at every step in his busy life. His energetic devotion to economic progress was the main theme of his being. Even during the closing chapter of his life, Governor White tirelessly boosted his State, inspired its people, and expressed faith in its future. His monuments are of his own erection. The din surrounding the industrial worker will echo into history as a tribute to the balance agriculture with industry program which was conceived, nurtured, and ripened by the intellect of Hugh White.

Loved and respected by all who knew him, Governor White's towering strength will be irreplaceable in the hearts and minds of his friends. The world is a better place because he passed our way.

I ask consent to insert at this point in the Record an article on the death of Governor White which appeared in the McComb, Miss., Enterprise Journal on September 20, 1965. It follows:

Gov. HUGH WHITE MOURNED AT 84—STATE, CITY LOSE A FAVORITE SON
(By Charles B. Gordon)

McComb's proudest native son who became Governor of Mississippi on two separate occasions, died at his home in Jackson early Monday at the age of 84.

Hugh Lawson White, son of the late Captain and Mrs. John J. White of McComb, succumbed peacefully to a heart attack brought on by his advanced age, relatives said.

Mississippi officials issued formal announcements of his death early today, then

ordered that flags at the capitol, which he graced in two notably successful terms as Governor, be lowered at half mast.

FUNERAL PLANS

Governor White's body was scheduled to lie in state at the new capitol from 2 p.m. to 8 p.m. today. Funeral services will be held at 11 a.m. Tuesday at one of Jackson's Baptist churches.

The body will be brought to McComb to J. J. White Memorial Presbyterian Church for final services set for 2 p.m. tomorrow.

Burial will take place in the family mausoleum in Hollywood Cemetery by the side of his illustrious parents and his first wife, who died 5 years ago last May 13.

Governor White's death came 1 week after this grateful community tendered him a "Hugh White Day," which he attended and enjoyed to the fullest.

HISTORIC FAMILY

Governor White was born here August 19, 1831, a son of Capt. J. J. and Helen Tyree White who had settled near Summit and operated a sawmill after Captain White completed his long tour of duty as a Confederate soldier.

Not long after McComb came into official existence in 1872, Captain White moved his mill and his family to what is now the Whitestown community of McComb.

The venerable rebel and his wife had three sons—Will, John J., and Hugh L.—all now deceased. Will White made his home at Pass Christian, and J. J. White, Jr., operated a laundry and other businesses in McComb until his death about 15 years ago.

White attended the University of Mississippi after his graduation from the McComb schools. He did not graduate but returned to the city to enter the family lumber business.

ADVANCED SWIFTLY

He swiftly gained a place of stature in the area's business and banking life that foretold of the immensity of his economic future and his productive work for his State.

When the pine forests of this immediate community reached a point of decline that made the move necessary, he moved the lumber business to Columbia, where he attained new heights of success over many fine years.

He had married Miss Judith Sugg, who came from Providence, Ky., to teach piano in McComb Female College, later a part of Belhaven College at Jackson.

The Whites had no children. After her death he married the former Miss Maxine Maxwell, who survives as the widow.

FEW RELATIVES

Of the immediate White family, only the following nieces and nephews survive:

Mrs. Helen White Brumfield, McComb; Hugh Johnson, Mrs. D. A. Ratliff and Mrs. Howard Rankin, Columbia, and Mrs. George Evans, Jackson.

He served as mayor of Columbia on three different occasions, then fixed his sights on State office. He was elected Governor in 1936 and fostered the now famous balance agriculture with industry program. The project sought to equalize the industrial work force with the traditional agriculture.

SECOND TERM

He was elected to a second term as Governor in 1952-56 and sandwiched a term in the State legislature during 1944-48.

Among his many philanthropies is the church in McComb that is a memorial to his father and a \$50,000 contribution to Belhaven College for a new dormitory as a memorial to his mother.

WEDS AGAIN

In April 1962, he honeymooned with his 40-year-old bride in New Orleans.

"It's the condition, the attitude, and the health of the man that make the difference," he said in an interview.

29804

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

September 22, 1965

"Who knows? She may be too old for me," said White with a smile.

"He may be right," his bride said. "I have a hard time keeping up with him and the busy schedule he keeps."

LOVED PROGRESS

"I'm not interested in holding a political job as I am in seeing the State move forward," he said.

This philosophy pushed the State ahead at a pace that has been unequalled.

White was a true Southern gentleman who was seldom seen without a coat and a rose in his label.

"I want to see at least one industry in every one of the 82 counties," White said, "I'll work for Mississippi just as long as I have breath to travel."

SHARING OF FEDERAL REVENUES

(Mr. REID of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from New York, Jacob K. JAVITS, speaking before the New York State County Officers Association in New York City, proposed a thoughtful and workable plan for the sharing of Federal tax revenues with the States. Our States need additional funds if they are to institute and maintain vital programs—particularly in education and health. I intend to cosponsor the Javits bill in the House of Representatives so that serious discussion and debate on this proposal can begin now.

A Federal-State tax revenue sharing plan was first suggested several years ago, yet there has been little serious discussion of the merits and certainly no concrete action on the proposal since that time.

The need for remission of certain Federal tax moneys to the States and localities is increasing clear. Property taxes on which much of education depends have risen about as high as they can go, yet the cost of education and other needed services and facilities continues to rise at a rapid rate.

Senator JAVITS has proposed a necessary and feasible piece of legislation. Under his proposal, 1 percent of the current income tax base would be deposited in a trust fund. Eighty percent of this fund would then be allocated to the States, on the basis of population. State efforts to raise their own revenue would not be discouraged, however, because State shares would be increased or decreased depending on the ratio of State-local general revenues to personal income in the State compared to the national average ratio. The remaining 20 percent would be distributed to the 12 or 15 States with the lowest per capita incomes.

States could use these moneys only for programs that would benefit directly the greatest number of people in the State—such as in the fields of health and education. Equitable sharing by States with local governments would also be insured.

I am pleased to join with the distinguished senior Senator from New York in sponsoring legislation along these lines and I compliment him on his initiative.

Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post this morning carried a descriptive article on Senator JAVITS' bill as well as an excellent editorial commending his suggestion. I ask unanimous consent to insert these two articles at this point in the RECORD.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 22, 1965]

JAVITS BREAKS THROUGH

Senator JACOB K. JAVITS deserves a burst of applause for introducing a bill that would provide for the sharing of surplus Federal revenues with the States. The prospect for tax legislation sponsored by a member of the minority party cannot be regarded as auspicious. But Mr. JAVITS is performing the necessary task of bringing a controversial proposal to the attention of Congress for the first time.

Mr. JAVITS' point of departure has already been amply discussed by proponents of revenue sharing. The Federal Government, under conditions of high employment, will collect more tax moneys than it can wisely spend. The State and local governments will be spending more money than they can raise through efficient measures of taxation. Both problems—the embarrassing affluence of the Federal Government and the pressing needs of State and local governments—can be neatly solved through a program of Federal revenue sharing.

In the Senator's thoughtful proposal, 1 percent of the current income tax base—about \$2.5 billion—would be deposited in a trust fund. The proceeds of the fund would then be allocated to the States. Each year 80 percent would be distributed on the basis of population and 20 percent would be divided among the 12 or 15 States with lowest per capita incomes.

The Federal grants would be used only to support programs in the fields of health, education, and welfare. This constraint would leave the States and localities ample freedom of action, while precluding the support of programs such as highway construction that are already heavily funded by the Congress.

The revenue sharing plan was first proposed by Walter W. Heller, former Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers. But the President, seemingly piqued by a premature leak, has maintained an air of chilly disdain. It would be ironic indeed if this important proposal, the brainchild of a Democrat, should become the property of the opposition.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 22, 1965]

UNITED STATES-STATE TAX-SHARING PLAN
REVISED BY JAVITS

(By Frank Porter)

A leading Republican Senator plucked a controversial Federal-State revenue-sharing plan off the administration's back burner yesterday and said he will offer it as legislation before the end of the current session.

"I think it is now generally agreed that some form of Federal assistance to State and local government is necessary but there has been a lack of serious discussion," said Senator JACOB K. JAVITS, Republican, of New York.

"Debate should begin, and decisions should be made on a tax-sharing plan before State and local governments become completely inundated in the flood of demands for new services and facilities, particularly in the fields of health, education, and welfare," JAVITS told the New York State County Officers Association in New York City.

JAVITS thereby stole a march on the White House itself, which put the plan under wraps last fall after its leaked details aroused intense opposition, particularly in labor and liberal circles.

Since then, however, it has attracted wide-

spread grassroots interest, particularly among State and local officials feeling a financial pinch.

Republicans have made political capital of it. During last fall's presidential campaign, even Barry Goldwater embraced the concept, fathered 5 years ago by Walter W. Heller shortly before he became President Kennedy's chief economic adviser. It was a prime topic of discussion at the Republican Governors conference earlier this year.

But the administration is apparently unmoved by the Javits initiative. A White House source said last night that the revenue-sharing plan is a "dead duck" and that there is no present intention of reviving it.

The Javits bill would follow closely the Heller concept as developed last year by a Presidential task force headed by Joseph A. Pechman, of the Brookings Institution. The White House has never released the Pechman report.

The carefully drawn measure also contains a number of safeguards and limitations which should go far to conciliate both conservative and liberal critics.

It would create a special trust fund of 1 percent of the individual income tax base—or about \$2.5 billion annually under present conditions.

Eighty percent of these funds would be allocated the States in proportion to their population. To maintain State efforts to raise their own revenue, however, these amounts would be increased or diminished by the amount the ratio of State-local general revenues to personal income in the State exceeded or lagged the National ratio.

The other 20 percent would be distributed to the 12 or 15 States with the lowest per capita incomes.

The funds could be used only for health, education, and welfare to benefit directly the greatest number of people in a State. Earlier critics had opposed a no-strings-type distribution on grounds the funds might be misused—say for an ornate Governor's mansion, or for highways at the expense of education.

The bill also would require an audit of how the funds are used, the equitable sharing of funds by the States with local governments, and certification that projects financed by these revenues comply with all Federal laws, such as the Civil Rights Act.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask whether the majority leader has cleared this with the minority leader?

Mr. ALBERT. I have cleared this with the Republican whip, the acting minority leader, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that this matter has been cleared with the minority whip.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

September 15, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

23141

of trade negotiations are cause for serious concern that the United States may not adopt the positive bargaining position necessary to keep even our existing export markets.

And, while these protectionist countries close their doors to American agriculture, they are at the same time demanding and getting easy access to our price-supported markets. Excessive farm imports into the United States have time and again made government price-support programs ineffective, and this lack of coordination between farm imports and farm programs has cost the farmer and taxpayer millions of dollars.

Mr. Speaker, constructive changes in our agricultural trade policy are a vital necessity if we are ever to come to terms with our domestic farm problems. A small shift in the balance between our imports and our exports could turn a farm surplus into a deficit. And, looking beyond the domestic front, not only would such changes help our balance-of-payments situation, but they would also vastly improve U.S. international relations.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include in the Record the agriculture task force statement on this subject, outlining the need for changes in our present agricultural trade policy, and recommending what the nature of such changes should be:

STATEMENT BY THE HOUSE REPUBLICAN TASK FORCE ON AGRICULTURE, SEPTEMBER 13, 1965

The future of American agriculture depends in large degree upon how U.S. foreign agricultural policy is conducted. The extent to which the United States moves toward sound policy goals in this area will greatly determine the extent to which we can solve our domestic farm problems.

SMALL YEARLY FARM SURPLUS

The large existing stocks of U.S. agricultural surpluses did not build up overnight. They accumulated as a result of relatively small year by year imbalances between production and utilization. The largest postwar change in our national stocks of farm commodities, for instance, occurred in 1948, when our farm production, combined with agricultural imports, amounted to 8.4 percent more than we could export or utilize domestically. The sum of U.S. farm production and agricultural imports from 1947 to 1964 exceeded the total domestic use and farm exports by a yearly average of only 1.7 percent. During that same period, exports amounted to 10.9 percent of our total utilization, and imports were 11.6 percent. It is obvious then, that a small shift in the balance between our imports and our exports could change a farm surplus into a deficit.

TRADE POLICY GAPS PREVENT BALANCE

The task force has found, however, that the lack of an adequate overall U.S. foreign agricultural trade policy has effectively prevented any such balance from taking place. We have found that serious shortcomings exist within this area of public policy—shortcomings which have worked to undermine not only our vital agricultural export trade, but also our domestic farm economy as well. U.S. agricultural trade policy is being carried out in crazy-quilt fashion, with numerous vacuums and gaps, and a remarkable lack of coordination.

ADMINISTRATION'S POLICY FAILURE

These shortcomings in our agricultural trade policies result principally from: (1) the failure of the administration to adopt a sound, positive agricultural trade policy that could resist the protectionist policies of

other trading countries, and better serve this Nation's agriculture and economy, and (2) the administration's failure to comply with the directive of Congress, as expressed in section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, to coordinate U.S. agricultural import policies with our domestic farm programs.

U.S. FARMER HURT BY FOREIGN PROTECTIONISM

Because of these failures, the U.S. farmer has been penalized by consistently inadequate prices and increasing Government production restrictions. Other countries, displaying highly protectionist attitudes, close their trade doors to American agricultural commodities, while at the same time demanding and getting easy access to our valuable markets. These countries impose heavy taxes and levies on our exports to them, while we take on the burden of subsidizing their exports to us with our price-supported markets.

EXPORTS VITAL TO FARMER AND U.S. ECONOMY

The maintenance and expansion of U.S. agricultural export markets is vital to the farmer and to the national economy as a whole, from which he purchases yearly some \$40 billion worth of goods, and provides employment for 6 million nonagricultural laborers. Last year, the export sale of the production of one out of every four U.S. crop acres acted to siphon off some of our farm surpluses, and contributed significantly to the easing of our unfavorable balance-of-payments situation.

EXPORT SALES ARE THREATENED

But our export markets are threatened by the protectionist policies of other countries. The United States is a highly liberal trader in comparison, protecting only 26 percent of her domestic market by nontariff barriers, in contrast to the United Kingdom, 37 percent; West Germany, 93 percent; Australia, 41 percent; and New Zealand, 100 percent.

Recent actions of the European Economic Community which threatens to substantially reduce U.S. exports of wheat, rice, poultry, eggs, dairy products, fruits and vegetables to Western Europe, are clear evidence that the U.S. policy of indiscriminately opening wide our trade doors has not changed the highly protectionist policies of other trading countries. The key to retaining our vital export markets lies in our negotiations with other countries, such as the current Kennedy round.

AGRICULTURE CAN'T BE SACRIFICED AT KENNEDY ROUND

Recent U.S. actions in regard to the agricultural negotiations in the Kennedy round provide grave cause for concern that agriculture may be shortchanged at Geneva. The United States last year allowed industrial negotiations to proceed without first determining the rules for agriculture, and just recently announced its decision to go ahead and submit agricultural trade proposals in September, even if the EEC does not. It is imperative that agriculture not be sacrificed in these negotiations. Failure to accomplish some realistic bargaining at the trade negotiations table will be a serious blow to American agriculture and to the future of world trade.

The United States must point out to her trading friends that world trade is a two-way street. We cannot expect to get something for nothing, but neither should we give indiscriminate access to our valuable U.S. markets without getting meaningful concessions in return.

IMPORTS AND PRICE-SUPPORT PROGRAMS

The export side, however, is only half the problem. The administration's failure to coordinate U.S. agricultural import policies with domestic price-support programs has cost the American farmer and taxpayer millions of dollars. Last year alone, as a result of the recent excessive beef imports, the

Government spent over \$220 million in purchases of surplus beef, but succeeded in sopping up an amount equal to only 10 percent of the imports.

FARM PROGRAMS SUFFER

Imports of foreign farm commodities in excessive and abnormal volume have time and again rendered U.S. farm price-support programs ineffective. The Government spends taxpayer money to take certain agricultural commodities out of production, but when imports of these same price-supported commodities increase excessively and undermine our costly farm programs the administration does nothing—except spend more money for surplus removal purchases.

CONGRESS AUTHORIZED SECTION 22

Congress authorized a coordinating mechanism—section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended, which allows the President, pursuant to a U.S. Tariff Commission investigation, to impose fees or quantitative restrictions on agricultural imports which interfere with U.S. price-support programs.

ADMINISTRATION HAS FAILED TO USE 22

But, in the last 4 years, the administration has repeatedly failed to use this effective coordinating device. On two recent occasions, the President actually enlarged the import quotas of certain price-supported commodities, contrary to Tariff Commission recommendations, and in two instances, in the face of market crisis, failed even to call for an investigation.

ITALIAN CHEESE MERRY-GO-ROUND

Millions of pounds of cheese were imported into this country from Italy in 1963 at prevailing world prices, while the USDA was storing huge surpluses of expensive CCC cheese. In order to dispose of the CCC surplus, the administration turned around and sold cheese back to Italy for the Italian school lunch program, at one-third its cost. Bizarre transactions such as this emphatically point out the need for use of section 22.

BEEF CRISIS COSTLY

The administration apparently did not learn from the cheese blunder, for it again failed to implement section 22, this time in the face of the approaching beef crisis. It remained for the Senate Committee on Finance to use its power to call for a Tariff Commission investigation of imports. This necessarily slower procedure finally resulted in congressional enactment of a beef quota, but only after a delay which ruined the domestic beef market.

REALISTIC POLICY NEEDED

A realistic U.S. agricultural trade policy is badly needed if this Nation is ever to make any progress toward the solution of its domestic agricultural problems, and the liberalization of world trade. The task force strongly recommends two steps to improve this situation: (1) Expansion of agricultural exports for dollars through the adoption of a more realistic and positive U.S. bargaining position at the trade negotiation tables of the world; and (2) congressional action to insure administration compliance with the congressional directive expressed in section 22—the directive to coordinate agricultural import policy with domestic price support programs.

A realistic U.S. agricultural trade policy will contribute much to the solution of our domestic farm problems, and will afford the United States the opportunity to achieve equitable and truly reciprocal trade agreements which will be of mutual benefit to all nations.

(Mr. WIDNALL (at the request of Mr. WYDLER) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the

25142

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

September 15, 1965

RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. WIDNALL'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MATSUNAGA). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. WOLFF] is recognized for 20 minutes.

[Mr. WOLFF addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

U.N. SHOULD PUT MUSCLE INTO GETTING PLEBISCITE IN KASHMIR

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MATSUNAGA). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, we are all deeply concerned by the tragic war between India and Pakistan. If ever a war was unnecessary and unwanted, it is this war.

Mr. Speaker, the dispute over Kashmir is rooted in religious differences and encumbered with national pride. This kind of dispute is the most intractable of all. Yet, unless man is to abandon hope for a peaceful world, some means of achieving a settlement for this kind of dispute must be found.

These disputes do not stem from the cold war. These conflicts arise from the mosaic history of man.

It would be well, Mr. Speaker, if the world had come to accept the use of arbitration or judicial procedures between nations. That time is coming. The current Washington Conference on World Peace Through Law is an example of an important effort to achieve this goal.

Meanwhile, the Kashmir dispute is before the world, and we must face it. If we can solve this problem through the use of international machinery we will contribute significantly to the evolution toward a world under law.

The merits of the Kashmir dispute have been examined by the United Nations. It concluded that the people of Kashmir should have the right to vote on the question of accession. The original accession itself was contingent upon such a vote. This procedure accords with the generally accepted tenet of the West that government ought to rest upon the assent of the governed.

The situation in Kashmir must be sharply distinguished from those conflicts which represent a breakup of nations. The Congo dispute illustrates this difference. In that case the Katanga province, historically a part of the whole nation, sought to break away. United Nations forces were used to keep the Congo intact.

The case of Kashmir is different. The accession of Kashmir to India was never completed and was attempted in a setting which raised a genuine question of its fairness. Permitting the people of Kashmir to vote on the question seems the only acceptable means of resolving the dispute.

U.N. NEEDS TO USE MUSCLE FOR SETTLEMENT

It is my deep conviction that the United Nations should put some muscle into the settlement of this dispute. Merely utilizing its good offices has failed for the past 16 years to produce a settlement.

The United Nations should resolve that it will press forward by whatever means are required to insure that a plebiscite takes place in some form within a reasonable time. The results of that plebiscite should be backed up by the United Nations.

Mr. Speaker, the harsh realities of this proposal must be faced. It is reported that for India to permit such a result may be destructive of the political stability of India, or that communal violence may be exacerbated. These possibilities cannot be blinked away. Yet these possibilities must be balanced against the alternatives and their dangers.

One thing is certain. It would be a thousand times easier for India to give way to a determined United Nations than to give way to Pakistan.

U.N. ACTION IS MORAL

This type of action by the United Nations is morally strong in an age when the moral nature of a decision is far more important than many seem to appreciate.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I turn to the position of the U.S. Government. If our Government elects to pursue the course I am urging, it must, of course, be done through the quiet diplomatic channels which precede any effective U.N. action. The major powers may not all agree, and some negotiation among them may first be necessary.

What I hope our Government will show, however, is a willingness to actively urge the use of such muscle by the U.N. as is necessary to finally settle the Kashmir dispute.

If the United Nations takes a more forceful stance, then, of course, the United States should actively support the United Nations and should regulate its trade and aid accordingly.

U.S. ECONOMIC AID SHOULD NOT BE SUSPENDED UNLESS U.N. REQUESTS IT

I oppose unilateral suspension of economic aid on our part. With two nations locked in struggle, the suspension of our economic aid would have an uneven impact upon the two nations. The nation most injured by our action would develop a lasting bitterness toward us.

We do not want other nations to intervene unilaterally. For the United States to unilaterally change our basic relationship with the two countries in trade or aid would constitute a unilateral intervention on our part. This risk re-emphasizes the need for the United Nations to take the lead in settling this dispute.

KASHMIR DISPUTE MUST BE KEPT OUT OF THE COLD WAR

Any lead which the United States may take in urging more forceful United Nations action will, of course, become known to both India and Pakistan. We may be reluctant to push ahead for fear of alienating one of the countries. Our

fear of such alienation stems from the cold war.

I hope that the United States does not succumb to this line of reasoning. It is self-defeating and will tend to destroy the capabilities of the United Nations which need to be built up, not torn down or ignored.

OPPORTUNITY FOR U.N. TO SERVE MANKIND

The U.N. needs to do what nations cannot do for themselves. The limitations imposed by internal political considerations are real and tough for any nation. Thus, the rest of the world, acting through the U.N., must bring about the settlement of this dispute.

Mr. Speaker, the United Nations has a unique opportunity to serve mankind. The General Assembly has been wisely freed from the paralyzing dispute over article 19. The fighting between India and Pakistan is outside the cold war, the merits of the underlying cause of the dispute are generally agreed upon, and the U.N. has the power to act.

Is there the willingness to act? This country and other members of the United Nations must come to fully embrace the fact that active employment of force in support of the political judgments of the United Nations offers the shortest, most direct path to a world of peace.

This unprecedented opportunity to demonstrate to the world the capacity of the United Nations to keep the peace should be pursued and not lost through hesitation or indecision.

No one can lightly suggest such direct action by the United Nations which may appear to be aimed at the interests of any nation. In the larger and more important perspective, the people of each nation share a common interest with the rest of mankind in the orderly settlement of disputes.

We have an enormous stake in the future of India as we do in Pakistan. We must help these countries resolve this conflict so that together we can build to meet the expectations of all the people of this world.

THE 200-BILLION ELECTRON VOLT BUNGL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MATSUNAGA). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the Atomic Energy Commission has so badly bungled the site selection process for the Nation's new 200 billion electron volt (Bev.) accelerator it should cancel all present proceedings and start anew.

The planned facility, now estimated to cost around \$340 million instead of the \$280 million originally estimated, now cannot be started on time because no one can even say where it will be built. One hundred twenty-six proposals came in from 46 of the 50 States who wanted it built in their borders. Only the offshore States of Alaska and Hawaii failed to bid, along with Delaware and Vermont who lack the 3,000 acres of clear, level land needed for the installation.

September 15, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

23143

Delegations from all interested States have pounded at the AEC's door to promote their claims and almost all affected Congressmen and Senators have got into the act one way or another. The 200-Bev. bonanza—the Government's biggest free offer to all comers since opening the Cherokee strip to homesteaders in 1893—has become one of Washington's biggest political hot potatoes. In face of the political pros' onslaught, the AEC has become mired in a mammoth pork barrel. It hoped Congress would soon adjourn and get some of its more persistent pursuers off its back. When that possibility dimmed, it panicked.

A promised screening down of the number of possible sites has been twice delayed. With the heat on for some action, the AEC came up today with new list, claiming progress by a screening down to 85 proposals. However, it made an inept attempt to keep its political skirts clean by leaving amongst the 85 proposals a grand total of 43 States. Only North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming sites were totally eliminated. These States have but six Senators and five Congressmen between them. The fact is that at least half the remaining proposals on the new list are dogs, unsuitable for consideration under one or more of the various site criteria originally specified by AEC.

The net effect of the action only will be to intensify injection of objectionable politics into a situation which should be one of purely scientific judgment—which judgment the AEC apparently seeks to dodge or delay. An investment of the major magnitude of this one must pay the highest dividends to the Nation and deserves insulation from either political politics or university politics. The latter have been dragged into the picture by the AEC's futile effort to dodge its cares by hiring the National Academy of Sciences to advise it on the screening and site selection problem. Almost the first discussion of the subject by NAS was by a group in which several university presidents or their representatives participated. People of this occupation are notable for zeroing in on prestige-laden projects—good for the university, but not necessarily intertwined inexorably with the highest national interest.

By embarking on a nationwide site hunt the AEC has totally and absolutely ignored the gut issue on locating this national facility which should have first been taken up. That issue has to do not only with the 200-Bev. accelerator, but its companion, to follow next, an even more costly 600-Bev. job. Both accelerators were conceived primarily by scientists primarily connected with the Nation's two existing major high energy physics locations. These are the Lawrence Radiation Laboratory in northern California and the Brookhaven National Laboratory on Long Island. The 200 Bev. was planned as a logical extension of the accelerator work at Lawrence and the 600 Bev. as the logical addition to Brookhaven.

Like the Star of Bethlehem which lead the Three Wise Men to the manger, Brookhaven and Lawrence have become the two great bright stars in the intellectual heavens drawing brilliant minds from the entire world to the United

States. They have established and maintained our undisputed leadership in high energy physics, nuclear chemistry and related sciences. Every single transuranium element has been discovered at one or the other of these centers. Lawrence alone, since its inception, has produced almost as many Nobel Prize winning chemists and physicists as not only the rest of the Nation, but the rest of the world, combined.

Unless the two new giant accelerators are located successively at Lawrence and Brookhaven, these great stars inevitably will commence to dim. There is no assurance that the location of these machines elsewhere will ever develop new teams of equal scientific excellence to replace those which may be squandered by deliberately dimming the lights at Brookhaven and Lawrence—a seemingly inescapable consequence of any decision to locate the new accelerators elsewhere.

In fact, there even exists a truly serious question of whether machines of the highest quality could be built at any other locations. Few, if any, of the Nation's scientists capable of designing and building such tools—and honed by experience in doing so—are located at any place other than Brookhaven and Lawrence.

No one can say that any of them would be willing to leave these locations for someplace else—in the boondocks of scientific thought or not. No one can say this because no one has bothered to check with them and find out. It is to be recalled that the Stanford Linear Accelerator, a similarly complicated scientific machine, had to be built on the Stanford University campus simply because the only people capable of building it already were there and declined to go elsewhere. You can order soldiers around and you can order scientists around in wartime—but the Vietnam war is not big enough yet to pull this off now. If these scientists capable of constructing the 200 Bev. will not move, then if the 200 Bev. is not located where they are, it will be turned over to less capable and less experienced hands and we will end up with an equally costly, but second rate machine. The Russians once had a somewhat similar experience which proved quite costly to them in both money and prestige. It hardly is time to repeat their mistake.

This issue of the future of the two Laboratories and the quality of the new machines, which means so much to the Nation, should have been met and decided long before the enticing possibility of the 200 Bev. bonanza was dangled bewitchingly before a host of chambers of commerce and local promotion associations throughout the country. Most certainly it should have been considered before—not contemporaneously with a lot of nonscientific considerations and clamor. My own judgment is that: First, the preeminence of two vital laboratories is in jeopardy; second, that development of new scientific teams of equal quality to existing ones is questionable; and, third, that the excellence of the new accelerator itself is in the balance—may be incorrect. I do not think so, but I shall be the first to leave the questions open. However, these questions do exist—legitimately and

seriously—they should have been resolved before any nationwide search for sites ever was commenced. This AEC exercise in how-to-succeed-in-site-selection - without - really - saddling - any - responsibility - seriously has just about turned the 200-Bev. bonanza into the 200-Bev. bungle. It should backtrack and do first things first.

If doing so indicates that a site other than Lawrence, and therefore Brookhaven for the next larger machine, will not diminish the Nation's interest it then will be time to resume the site search. If it does so and pays any attention whatever to realities and to the site criteria which have been announced, it then will become readily apparent that practically the only really promising locations radiate out from the Chicago area into only about five States—Minnesota, Michigan, Illinois, Indiana, and Missouri. This indicates clearly that 37 more States could have been lopped off the list announced today by AEC if only sound scientific considerations had been used in making it up.

To forestall any innuendo that my remarks are being made parochially as a Californian let me say that I am a southern Californian representing a district at least 450 miles distant from Lawrence Laboratory. From the political standpoint it affects me not one whit where the 200 Bev. goes. But as an informed legislator, concerned both with maintaining our country's scientific excellence and with getting the top dollar from the very expensive public investment, I have deep concern that we proceed with it in a sound way. I also have a deep concern over the delay indicated today by the AEC from its mishandling of the site problem. The accelerator was supposed to be authorized next year and work started. The site selection mess indicates the project will slip an entire year. Meanwhile the Soviets are calmly and deliberately pushing to completion their new 70-Bev. accelerator, a high energy research tool over twice the power of any existing in the United States. Soon it will be probing for secrets of the universe having the utmost strategic importance. While Russia learns America burns with squabbles in Congress, at the AEC and at the White House over where to put a political plum.

In saying what I have said today, let me assure you that I still have the highest respect professionally for the members of the Atomic Energy Commission and for their honesty and integrity. The doubt I have relates to the lack of a political competency, which they are not supposed to have in the first place, and to the characteristics of commission-type management which inevitably results in indecision, buckpassing and reluctance to assume responsibility for hard decisions whenever duties are shared amongst several people rather than concentrated in one strong hand.

SUPREME COURT DECISION ON CERTAIN POSTAL DELIVERIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, in 1962, this House, with only two dissenting votes, passed legislation denying the free delivery by the U.S. Post Office Department to unsolicited Communist political propaganda. At that time the reason behind the legislation was the fact that Communist countries did not grant free access to American newspapers, magazines, and printed matter. There was a consensus then, and I believe that there is a consensus now, that it is an imposition on American taxpayers to ask our deficit-ridden post office to carry Communist literature when there is no reciprocity on the part of most Communist countries.

Since 1962, the situation has not changed. Communist countries still do not deliver our newspapers, periodicals, and other printed matter. In fact, postal authorities of the U.S.S.R. recently announced prohibitions and import restrictions which now apply to parcel post and postal union mail packages addressed to that country, including printed matter, pictures, and recordings which they consider contrary to the interests of the U.S.S.R. The U.S. Supreme Court, however, declared the 1962 legislation unconstitutional. In its opinion the Court stated:

We rest on the narrow ground that the addressee in order to receive his mail must request in writing that it be delivered. This amounts in our judgment to an unconstitutional abridgment of the addressee's first amendments rights. The addressee carries an affirmative obligation which we do not think the Government may impose on him. This requirement is almost certain to have a deterrent effect, especially as respects those who have sensitive positions. Their livelihood may be dependent on a security clearance. Public officials, like schoolteachers who have no tenure, might think they would invite disaster if they read what the Federal Government says contains the seeds of treason. Apart from them, any addressee is likely to feel some inhibition in sending for literature which Federal officials have condemned as Communist political propaganda.

In company with many eminent lawyers, I respectfully disagree with the Court's opinion. Nevertheless, the act was struck down and the Communist countries are still taking advantage of our subsidized postal system to deliver their newspapers, magazines, and so forth, free in this country, while they offer us nothing in return. There is a need for new legislation in this area; legislation which will both offer the Communists incentives to deliver our literature and will at the same time guarantee the first amendment rights which the Supreme Court believed it was striving to protect.

Today I am offering the House of Representatives such legislation. This is new legislation and I know it will meet all of the Supreme Court's objections to the earlier bill. It is aimed at the question of reciprocity. If Communist countries carry our newspapers, periodicals and other printed matter, then let our postal system be open to them. But if Communist countries do not grant us equal postal rights, then it is for the Congress to say whether we will subsidize their mail when we get no quid pro quo.

Let me read the very simple language of the bill:

(a) The United States mails, except first class and airmail shall not be available for the transportation or delivery of newspapers, periodicals, or other printed matter originating in any foreign country, or deposited in the United States mails by or in behalf of any foreign country, from which any type of foreign assistance is withheld pursuant to section 620(f) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended (22 U.S.C. 2370(f)), unless—

(1) The President determines that any such country transports and deliver the United States newspapers, periodicals, or other printed matter, wherever originating, or mailed, without restriction in its postal system; or

(2) Such country shall have entered into a reciprocal cultural agreement with the United States under which the United States and such country agree to transport and deliver in their mails equal quantities of newspapers, periodicals, or other printed matter on the express condition that the postal system of neither country shall be available for the transportation and delivery of amounts of matter in excess of the amounts specified in the reciprocal cultural agreement.

(b) Subsection (a) of this section shall not apply to newspapers, periodicals, or other printed matter, wherever originating, addressed to any (A) United States Government agency, (B) public library, (C) college, university, or other institution of higher learning, (D) scientific or professional institution for advanced studies, or (E) any official of any of the foregoing.

This legislation does not lock out ideas or deny Americans access to any information whatsoever. First class and air mail are specifically exempted from its provisions since it is not intended to impede communications, but to induce reciprocity. The choice, then, is up to the Communist governments; if they will consent to carry our literature, then we will carry theirs. The issue is reciprocity and that issue must be resolved.

This legislation is founded on the congressional postal authority and the fiscal power of Congress. If Congress has the authority to set postal rates for different classes of mail, certainly it has the power to give or deny a subsidy to a class of mail originating in countries withholding free use of their mail service reciprocally to the United States.

Vice President HUMPHREY in 1961, then in the Senate, made the point well when he said:

I believe the time has come for the U.S. Government to inform the Soviet Union that there must be a quid pro quo for the use of our postal service. In other words, it is time we said, "all right, Mr. Khrushchev; you may use the postal service of the United States when and if you let the United States use the postal service of the Soviet Union on a 50-50 reciprocity basis; not a basis of one horse to one rabbit, which is what is happening now—with the United States getting the rabbit."

I am in complete accord with the Vice President in this respect.

The time for such legislation is ripe. The issue fought out in 1962 is even more serious in 1965. We are now in a hotter war in Vietnam. We are in a period of emergency. There is every reason for the American point of view to be expressed in Iron Curtain countries, just as Iron Curtain countries are now able to

express their views in this country through our subsidized postal system. The war in Vietnam is expensive enough in lives, and less importantly, in funds. We ought not to add to this cost by burdening the American taxpayers with the delivery of Communist literature when we get no quid pro quo. Earlier this year the President appointed a committee of eminent citizens to report to him on whether or not we should increase trade with Communist countries. This report contained many well-reasoned recommendations among which was the following:

In the Committee's view, the time is ripe to make more active use of trade arrangements as political instruments in relations with Communist countries. Trade should be brought into the political arena. It should be offered or withheld, purposefully and systematically, as opportunities and circumstances warrant. This requires that the President be put in a position to remove trade restrictions on a selective and discretionary basis or to reimpose them as justified by our relations with individual Communist countries.

Trade moves should be adapted to circumstances in individual countries and used to gain improvements in, and to build a better foundation for our relations with these countries. As opportunities arise, the United States should enter into government-to-government negotiations with individual Communist countries on this front, bargaining as Yankee traders for reciprocal advantage.

Again, the issue is reciprocity; this issue must be resolved. I urge passage of this legislation.

WATER RESOURCES POLICY— A TIME FOR DECISION

(Mr. OTTINGER (at the request of Mr. CORMAN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, no internal need facing the United States today is of greater importance than proper management of the Nation's water resources.

For the northeastern region of the Nation, this need is not only important, it is urgent. The serious consequences of the present drought have dramatically exposed the dangers of slipshod planning and the folly of following the counsels of political expediency in dealing with a natural resource as important as water.

Later this week, the House is scheduled to vote upon a proposal which has an important bearing on the northeastern water situation. The proposal is contained in an amendment to section 101 of the omnibus rivers and harbors bill reported favorably by the House Public Works Committee last Thursday.

This section would direct the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to prepare a plan for, first, the construction, operation and maintenance by the United States of a system of major reservoirs in the river basins of the northeastern region; second, a system of conveyance facilities by which water can be exchanged between these basins; and, third, major purification facilities.

The aim of this legislation is laudable and the distinguished gentlemen of t

22506

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD - SENATE

September 9, 1965

H.R. 1004. An act to amend the act of July 2, 1955, relating to office space in the United States Capitol, and for other purposes. (Rept. No. 700)

S. Con. Res. 46. Concurrent resolution to authorize placing temporarily in the rotunda of the Capitol the statue of the late Senator Dennis Chavez. (Rept. No. 703)

S. Con. Res. 47. Concurrent resolution to authorize the acceptance by Congress of the statue of the late Senator Dennis Chavez. (Rept. No. 703)

S. Con. Res. 48. Concurrent resolution to print as a Senate document the proceedings of the presentation, dedication, and acceptance by Congress of the statue of the late Senator Dennis Chavez. (Rept. No. 703)

H. Con. Res. 101. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of "The Prayer Room in the United States Capitol". (Rept. No. 705); and

S. Res. 21. Resolution providing for the awarding of service pins or emblems to Members, officers, and employees of the Senate. (Rept. No. 702)

By Mr. PELL, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with amendments:

S. 1310. A bill relating to the National Museum of the Smithsonian Institution. (Rept. No. 704)

REPEAL OF SECTION 14(b) OF NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—INDIVIDUAL VIEWS—(S. REPT. NO. 697)

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I report favorably, with amendments, the bill (H.R. 77) to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and section 705(b) of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 and to amend the first proviso of section 8(a) (3) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and I submit a report thereon. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed, together with the individual views of Senators FANNIN, JAVITS, PROUTY, DOMINICK, and MURPHY.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina in the chair). The report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and, without objection, the report will be printed, as requested by the Senator from Michigan.

BONDING PROVISIONS OF FEDERAL LABOR LAWS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—SUPPLEMENTAL AND INDIVIDUAL VIEWS—(S. REPT. NO. 698)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I report favorably, without amendment, the bill (H.R. 5883) to amend the bonding provisions of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 and the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act, and I submit a report thereon. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed, together with the supplemental views of Senators JAVITS, PROUTY, and FANNIN, and the individual views of Senator PROUTY.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and, without

objection, the report will be printed as requested by the Senator from Oregon.

PROVISION FOR RESPONDING TO INVITATIONS FROM FOREIGN PARLIAMENTARY BODIES—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 700)

Mr. SPARKMAN, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 145) to provide for responding to invitations from foreign parliamentary bodies, which report was ordered to be printed, and the resolution to be placed on the calendar, as follows:

S. Res. 145

Resolved, That the President of the Senate is authorized to appoint as Members of official Senate delegations such Members of the Senate as may be necessary to respond to invitations received officially from foreign governments or parliamentary bodies during the 89th Congress, and to designate the chairmen of said delegations.

Sec. 2. The expenses of the delegations, including staff members designated by the chairmen to assist said delegations, shall not exceed \$25,000 for each such delegation, and shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairmen of said delegations.

FANNIE E. HOLLOWAY—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 146) to pay a gratuity to Fannie E. Holloway, which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Fannie E. Holloway, widow of John H. Holloway, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to nine and one-half months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. PROUTY.

S. 2509. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to employers for the expenses of providing training programs for employees and prospective employees; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. PROUTY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 2510. A bill for the relief of the city of El Dorado, Kans.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. CARLSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BAYH:

S. 2511. A bill for the relief of certain postal employees in Bloomington, Ind.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HART:

S. 2512. A bill to amend section 5(a) of the Clayton Act with respect to the evidentiary effect of judgments and decrees

entered in proceedings instituted by the United States under the antitrust laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. HART when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SPARKMAN (by request):

S.J. Res. 107. Joint resolution providing for acceptance by the United States of two instruments for the amendment of the constitution of the International Labor Organization; and

S.J. Res. 108. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution providing for membership of the United States in the Pan American Institute of Geography and History and to authorize appropriations therefor; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. SPARKMAN when he introduced the above joint resolutions, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. MUNDT:

S.J. Res. 109. Joint resolution directing the National Capital Planning Commission to make a study of the site selected for the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts and any other sites proposed for such Center; to the Committee on Public Works. (See the remarks of Mr. MUNDT when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION TO EXPRESS THE SENSE OF CONGRESS WITH RESPECT TO THE CURRENT ARMED CONFLICT BETWEEN INDIA AND PAKISTAN

Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. MORSE) submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 58) to express the sense of Congress with respect to the current armed conflict between India and Pakistan, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. JAVITS, which appears under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTIONS

PROVISION FOR RESPONDING TO INVITATIONS FROM FOREIGN PARLIAMENTARY BODIES

Mr. SPARKMAN, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 145) to provide for responding to invitations from foreign parliamentary bodies, which was placed on the calendar.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. SPARKMAN, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees".)

FANNIE E. HOLLOWAY

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 146) to pay a gratuity to Fannie E. Holloway, which was placed on the calendar.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees".)

THE HUMAN INVESTMENT ACT

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill

September 9, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

22521

National Section must be enabled to function effectively.

The Department of State believes that experience over the past years has demonstrated that the Institute is an effective instrument for promoting geographic and historical research development throughout Latin America. Furthermore, the U.S. Government is interested in improving the economic structure of these countries, and the Institute, a small organization whose activities are especially adapted to the area, is contributing significantly to the overall development in this field.

STUDY BY NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION OF SITE FOR THE JOHN F. KENNEDY CENTER FOR THE PERFORMING ARTS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution requiring the National Capital Planning Commission to make a detailed study and to hold public hearings on the subject of the best possible site for the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.

I am sure that all of us have become increasingly aware and worried over the public debate and controversy that has developed as a result of the selection of the present Potomac River site. Many influential and knowledgeable organizations have criticized the Potomac location. Recently the American Institute of Architects adopted a resolution which questioned the whether the present location is adequate to receive properly a building of the size and importance of the contemplated Center, and stating that it believed that another location might provide a more appropriate site for this great memorial. Several leading newspapers, including the New York Times and the Washington Post, have urged that a better site be chosen.

In view of the serious questions that have been raised, the permanency of the building to be erected, the amount of money involved, and the general desire to insure that our Capital City be developed in an orderly and satisfactory way, I think it only logical and prudent that the National Capital Planning Commission, which is the agency created by the Congress to be responsible for the development of the Nation's Capital, make this study.

I do not believe that this matter has received the detailed consideration that it deserves. The National Capital Planning Commission has never really been consulted. In 1958, when previous plans calling for a cultural center directly across from the National Gallery were abandoned, the Planning Commission was more or less told to select a site along the Potomac. Attempts to get the project off the ground were less than successful and it was not until the cultural center was selected as the memorial for the late President Kennedy that the impetus was provided for the completion of the project.

At the time it was only natural for those in charge of planning the center to want to move forward as quickly as possible with the existing authorization. The entire country was engulfed by a wave of emotion that has never been

equaled. Now, however, I believe we should take a sober second look and select the best possible site for this memorial.

Mr. President, I do not pertain to be an expert on city planning. This is why I am proposing no particular spot and this is why I am suggesting that a competent panel be placed in charge of the decisionmaking. I must say, however, that I am not particularly impressed with the reasons advanced by those who wish to keep the Potomac site which is presently proposed.

The board of trustees of the Kennedy Cultural Center seem to believe that we have gone too far to change our minds. I disagree. We have not started to build. We have not expended any funds for acquisition of land. All that has been accomplished thus far is to let the bids for demolition. While there may be some added cost if the existing plans would have to be modified, this would be a minimal sum when you consider the total cost involved and how permanent that expenditure will be once the building is constructed. If the Potomac site is a mistake, then it should be corrected and it is still not too late to correct a bad mistake, even if we have to do it at this 11th hour.

I must admit that I am personally reluctant to see the Potomac River bank utilized for a project of this type. This is valuable land. Perhaps not as valuable in a monetary sense as some other locations might be, but valuable in the sense that it still contains much God-given natural beauty.

In my home State of South Dakota we are fortunate in having thousands of acres of land that still repose in their natural setting. It is beautiful scenery for man cannot improve upon the Lord's architecture. This is a legacy that has been given to us by our ancestors and which we in turn should endeavor to pass on to those who succeed us. It is, unfortunately, a dwindling legacy.

In Washington this matter is becoming particularly acute. When you consider the total metropolitan area as belonging to the city of Washington, it is evident that we are rapidly approaching the time when we will be the center of a gigantic circle of concrete miles away from such things as open space, grass, trees, winding river banks, and fresh air. With the exception of Rock Creek Park, the banks of the Potomac represent just about the last possibility to preserve these natural beauties.

Recreation has taken on added significance during the past decade. It is only natural to assume that this trend will continue. The Potomac will grow more valuable as the demand for recreational areas increases. To future generations, a place to swim, to fish, to sun bathe, or simply take a walk along a wooded lane may well be fully as important as a cultural center.

I do not believe, however, that the reasons for calling for a reappraisal of the location need rest on these arguments alone. It would appear that several positive factors have entered the scene that were not considered originally and could very well change the initial plan.

This site was chosen in 1958 before the plan for redesigning Pennsylvania Avenue came along. Now a Commission has been established and these gentlemen are attempting, assumably, to make Pennsylvania Avenue into the showcase thoroughfare envisioned by Pierre L'Enfant more than 150 years ago. A cultural center located on the avenue could very well contribute to this plan. It should at least be considered along with all other attractive and available sites.

A location that would be more centrally located and thus more easily accessible would seem to be a cogent reason for relocation. The Potomac site is nowhere near the center of the city and visitors would have to rely almost entirely on automobile transportation. In contrast, a cultural center located in the heart of the city could utilize the new subway system as well as old-fashioned shoe leather. The subway system, once again, is a new factor that has arisen. At the time of the original selection it was merely a dream; now it is becoming a reality.

Finally there is the question of availability of new funds. With the enactment into law of the recently passed housing bill, urban renewal funds are available for the first time for the District of Columbia. Such funds have been used in other cities to acquire sites for cultural centers and this possibility should be examined in Washington.

Mr. President, I want to make it clear that in sponsoring this resolution I am not attempting to delay the construction of the Cultural Center. I am interested only in insuring that the best possible site be selected. Furthermore, I am not proposing any particular site but rather suggesting that the National Capital Planning Commission be required to make a detailed study of the site selection and to propose its knowledgeable recommendation. Finally, I am not proposing that such a study long delay the project. Under the terms of the resolution, the Planning Commission would be required to make its report in 90 days and no construction could be carried on while the Commission makes its study.

Similar resolutions have been introduced in the other Chamber. I urge that the Senate pass this joint resolution so that we may bring this matter out in the open. If the relative merits of the proposed sites are to be debated, they should be debated before the agency responsible—the National Capital Planning Commission. Passage of this resolution would assure such careful consideration by the appropriate group.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 109) directing the National Capital Planning Commission to make a study of the site selected for the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts and any other sites proposed for such Center, introduced by Mr. MUNDT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

22522

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

September 9, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL SUPPORT URGED
FOR INDIA-PAKISTAN PEACE
EFFORTS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse] and myself I submit a concurrent resolution concerning the hostilities which are going on in India and Pakistan.

In submitting this measure I point out that the stakes are too high for India, for Pakistan, and for the world to permit a continuation or escalation of the fighting that could ultimately lead to the destruction of one or both of the adversaries and virtually invite Communist China to interfere in a major way in the affairs of the subcontinent.

I feel that Congress, as representatives of the people of the United States, should make known its support of all efforts by the United Nations and other international organizations to bring about an immediate cease-fire in the Indian subcontinent.

We should support the President's interim action in withholding military aid to both countries. We should also support the President, and not tie his hands, in the dispensing of nonmilitary aid to India and Pakistan. The President has complete authority, under the Gruening-Javits-Morse amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act, passed in 1963, to make a factual determination whether or not any country receiving our assistance is preparing for or engaged in aggressive military efforts against another aid recipient, requiring that assistance to that country be temporarily suspended. That amendment is now section 620(1) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended.

We should support the President and not tie his hands, and we should back the United Nations in its effort to end the fighting, and thus maintain a consistent, unified policy.

I am pleased to note that this is a bipartisan concurrent resolution. It is the great tradition of our country that we close ranks in international emergencies. That is what this resolution seeks to accomplish.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 58) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas the United States is committed to the peaceful settlement of international disputes; and

Whereas the current armed conflict between India and Pakistan is inimical to the interests of the countries concerned and of the United States, and endangers international peace; and

Whereas it is the desire of the United States to maintain mutually friendly and productive relations with both Pakistan and India: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) The United States should support and encourage United Nations efforts and take other appropriate measures, as the President determines, to bring an end to the armed conflict between India and Pakistan at the earliest possible moment.

(2) The Congress supports and approves the interim action of the President in withholding military assistance during the continuation of military hostilities between India and Pakistan and invites the President to consider making a determination pursuant to section 620(1) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 with respect to the temporary suspension of economic and military assistance to Pakistan or India during the continuation of military hostilities between them.

APPROVAL OF COPPER ACCORDS
BY CHILEAN SENATE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, every Member of the Senate should be heartened by the fact that, according to a news dispatch which has just come in, the Chilean Senate has approved the copper agreements which President Frei negotiated with American copper companies in Chile. The copper accords already had the approval of the Chilean Chamber of Deputies, where President Frei's Christian Democrats have a majority, but there had been considerable question whether the agreements would be blocked in the Chilean Senate.

The Chilean copper agreements demonstrate the range of possibilities of mutually satisfactory settlement in a sensitive area of private foreign investment in Latin America, and as such have very broad significance. Not only does the removal of this last major obstacle to final approval of the agreements constitute an important victory for President Frei's program, but the action which the Chilean Senate has just taken is a great and constructive contribution to inter-American cooperation.

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ACT OF
1965—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 437

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. President, I have just submitted an amendment to the wheat title of H.R. 9811 which will:

First. Continue the domestic certificate—two-price approach, which has been used successfully the past 2 years.

Second. Provide for a variable export certificate under which wheat farmers would receive the full net returns from commercial wheat export operations.

Third. Enable wheat to be competitive with feed grains, as in recent years, and thereby permit the continuation of the popular acreage substitution provision of the wheat and feed grain programs.

All other provisions of the Senate bill relating to allotments, diversion, price support, and income goals would be unchanged.

The bill reported by the Senate committee provides direct payments to the cooperating producer on this entire production while maintaining the requirement that wheat users buy certificates. This approach could, in the years ahead, create difficulties in trade negotiations, since it supports export wheat as well as wheat used domestically—a device which invites retaliation by other governments. By returning to the domestic parity approach, the McGovern amendment will enable U.S. wheat producers to produce

for only the domestic market if they wish and receive price support based on parity. If producers want to produce more, they may do so at world market prices or near that level without depending on heavy export subsidies. This will enable U.S. wheat to compete for a fair share of the world markets within trading rules acceptable to competing countries.

The variable export amendment would follow the pattern now used by some other wheat exporting nations. On all export wheat, farmers would receive the basic price support loan. In addition, the Department of Agriculture would establish for exporters on a daily basis either a certificate sale value or a refund, which would make U.S. wheat prices competitive at the world level. If world wheat prices were above U.S. wheat prices, certificates would be sold to exporters. Receipts would be pooled, and net receipts above refunds to exporters would be allocated to wheat producers at the end of the year.

The amendment provides that the loan level shall take account of the feed value of wheat and will enable farmers who participate in the wheat and feed grain programs to substitute, acre for acre, between feed grains and wheat as best suits their individual farming operations.

The Senate committee bill did not contain authority for setting the basic loan level on wheat so that it could be competitive with feed grains. My amendment takes care of that situation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and will lie on the table.

AMENDMENT NO. 438

Mr. PROXMIRE (for himself, Mr. MACHUSON, Mr. HART, Mr. JACKSON, and Mr. FULBRIGHT), submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to House bill 9811, the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT NO. 439

Mr. DODD submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 9811, the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 440 AND 441

Mr. BREWSTER submitted two amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 9811, the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL
AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of S. 1676, my bill to provide for certain reorganizations in the Department of State and Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the name of the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] be added as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Senate

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 9, 1965

(Legislative day of Wednesday, September 8, 1965)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore [Mr. METCALF].

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, as in reverence we hallow Thy name, so may we hallow our own as we keep our honor bright, our hearts pure, our ideals untarnished, and our devotion to the Nation's welfare high and true.

As within this quiet Chamber of governance we close the door for this still moment upon the wild and violent world without, we seek Thee anew within, until thoughts grow reverent again, waiting tasks are glorified and our whole being is dominated by a faith in the ultimate decency of the world because the God behind the shadows, and in them, can transfigure all common things into shining sacraments of love.

We ask it through riches of grace in Christ Jesus, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, September 8, 1965, was dispensed with.

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ACT OF 1965

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 9811) to maintain farm income, to stabilize prices and assure adequate supplies of agricultural commodities, to reduce surpluses, lower Government costs and promote foreign trade, to afford greater economic opportunity in rural areas, and for other purposes.

Mr. ELLENDER obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Louisiana yield to me briefly?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from Montana without losing my right to the floor.

CALL OF CERTAIN MEASURES ON THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of certain measures on the calendar, beginning with Calendar No. 670.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will state the first bill.

RESPONSIBILITY FOR MARKING OF OBSTRUCTIONS IN NAVIGABLE WATERS

The bill (H.R. 725) to clarify the responsibility for marking of obstructions in navigable waters was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 688), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of H.R. 725 is to clarify the responsibility, as among Government agencies, for marking obstructions in navigable waters.

BACKGROUND

Current law provides that the Corps of Engineers and the Coast Guard are responsible for marking wrecks in navigable waters. However, the extent of the responsibility of each is unclear. This bill, as recommended by the Secretary of the Treasury, provides that the primary obligation for marking all obstructions to navigation rests with the Coast Guard. This should completely eliminate the present lack of clarity.

The bill in no way abrogates the existing responsibility of the Corps of Engineers to remove obstructions, or the existing responsibility of shipowners to mark the obstructions.

Specifically, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to mark wrecks and other obstructions which, in his judgment, constitute obstructions to navigation.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE COAST GUARD BAND

The bill (H.R. 727) to provide for the administration of the Coast Guard Band was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 689), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of H.R. 727 is to permit the Coast Guard to select as the conductor of its band an officer, and to accord statutory recognition to the Coast Guard Band.

BACKGROUND

Currently the Coast Guard Band is conducted by a warrant officer, while all other service bands are conducted by officers. This bill requires the conductor to be an officer

who is at least a lieutenant (junior grade) but not higher than a lieutenant commander. The committee believes this range of rank is consistent with the duties and responsibilities.

The Coast Guard Band is based at the Coast Guard Academy at New London, Conn. It performs for ceremonial functions at the Academy, and also travels throughout the country for various performances. This bill will contribute to leveling this aspect of the Coast Guard with other services, and will generally promote the prestige of the Coast Guard.

RETIREMENT OF ENLISTED MEMBERS OF THE COAST GUARD RESERVE

The bill (H.R. 7779) to provide for the retirement of enlisted members of the Coast Guard Reserve was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 690), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of H.R. 7779 is to permit voluntary retirement by members of the enlisted Coast Guard Reserve who have served on active duty on the same basis as similarly situated enlisted personnel of the Regular Coast Guard.

BACKGROUND

Present law discriminates against Coast Guard reserve personnel in retirement pay. Members of the Regular Coast Guard who have served 20 years of active duty are entitled to retire voluntarily and receive retirement pay in the amount of 2.5 percent of their basic pay multiplied by the number of years of active service. However, there is no such provision for members of the Coast Guard Reserve, who have served 20 or more years on active duty. Members of the Reserve who were members in January 1953 and who will have completed their active duty by January 1973 may receive similar benefits under a statute enacted on behalf of both Naval and Coast Guard reservists.

Presently there are approximately 11 members of the Coast Guard Reserve serving on extended tours of active duty who do not qualify under the special legislation described above, either because they were not members of the Reserve in January 1953 or because they will not have served their entire 20 years on active duty before January 1973.

This bill will provide the same treatment for these excluded Coast Guard reservists as for members of the Naval Fleet Reserve and of the Regular Coast Guard.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, that concludes the call of the calendar.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me for the purpose of taking up a House bill

22440

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

September 9, 1965

that I believe can be disposed of in a few minutes?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator suspend while the Senate receives a message from the House of Representatives on this matter?

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 10775. An act to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 10871. An act making appropriations for foreign assistance and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 795. An act to provide for the assessing of Indian trust and restricted lands within the Lummi Indian diking project on the Lummi Indian Reservation in the State of Washington, through a drainage and diking district formed under the laws of the State;

S. 949. An act to promote commerce and encourage economic growth by supporting State and interstate programs to place the findings of science usefully in the hands of American enterprise;

S. 2420. An act to provide continuing authority for the protection of former Presidents and their wives or widows, and for other purposes;

S.J. Res. 89. Joint resolution extending for 2 years the existing authority for the erection in the District of Columbia of a memorial to Mary McLeod Bethune; and

S.J. Res. 102. Joint resolution to authorize funds for the Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice and the District of Columbia Commission on Crime and Law Enforcement.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 10871) making appropriations for Foreign Assistance and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

AUTHORIZATION OF CERTAIN CONSTRUCTION OF MILITARY INSTALLATIONS

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Chair lay before the Senate, for immediate consideration, H.R. 10775, to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes, which was passed by the House on Tuesday last.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the bill (H.R. 10775) to authorize certain construction of military installations, and for other

purposes, which was read twice by its title.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I ask the distinguished Senator from Mississippi whether or not the ranking minority member on the committee, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] is in agreement.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the bill has been cleared for passage by the Senator from Massachusetts. I shall make a brief statement with respect to the bill, which will clarify the matter.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the Senator. May I ask whether the members of the minority are in agreement?

Mr. STENNIS. They are.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, although I reserved the right to object, I now have no objection, in view of the circumstances.

Mr. STENNIS. The bill now before the Senate takes the place of the bill vetoed by the President of the United States (H.R. 8439). It is exactly the same as the bill passed by the Senate and the House heretofore except in two particulars. The first is the section to which the President objected with respect to the delay of time in the closing of camps, posts, stations, yards, or other installations under the authority of the Department of Defense.

The section substituted for the one in the old bill provides that they shall not be closed until after the expiration of 30 days from the date upon which a full report of the facts, including justifications therefore for such proposed action, is submitted by the Secretary of Defense to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

The position of the Senate was not nearly so strong with reference to this delay as was that of the House of Representatives. I believe that this section is satisfactory generally to all members of the Senate Committee on Armed Services, and we unanimously recommend its adoption by the Senate.

The other exception relates to a requirement in section 609 of the House version of the old bill that the expenditure of funds for the construction of buildings for the Aerospace Corp. must be by a line item authorization, for the Air Force just as a military installation has to have a line item authorization. The Senate denied this provision in that it was singular in purpose. The conferees agreed on the purpose of the section, but broadened it in scope to apply not only to aerospace but to other similar undertakings, as well.

There was some confusion about the meaning of the language, and it was decided to adopt the section in the original bill and carry over until next year the technical problem of expanding the

language to cover other installations. We believe the section is sound and should be adopted.

The bill was not referred to the Committee on Armed Services. I discussed the question with the membership, and it was agreed that the referral was not necessary.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and I conferred about the bill yesterday. He cannot be in the Chamber at this moment, but he agrees to the bill in its present form, as do all other members of the committee.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that sections 609 and 611 of the bill, H.R. 10775 be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the sections were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Sec. 609. Every contract between the Secretary of the Air Force and the Aerospace Corporation shall prohibit the construction of any facility or the acquisition of any real property by the Aerospace Corporation unless such construction or acquisition has first been authorized to the Air Force by the Congress.

Sec. 611. (a) No camp, post, station, base, yard, or other installation under the authority of the Department of Defense shall be closed or abandoned until after the expiration of thirty days from the date upon which a full report of the facts, including the justification for such proposed action, submitted by the Secretary of Defense to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives.

(b) This section shall apply only to posts, camps, stations, bases, yards, or other installations that are located in the United States and Puerto Rico and have a total military and civilian complement of more than two hundred and fifty. It shall not apply to any facility used primarily for river and harbor projects or flood control projects.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading.

The bill (H.R. 10775) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

THE MILITARY CONFLICT OVER KASHMIR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for more than a decade and a half, the good sense of the leadership in India and Pakistan and the work of the United Nations have served to maintain a truce in Kashmir. It is a truce which has been threatened many times but, always, in the past has been reasserted.

Now there has been a massive collapse of the truce. It is carrying down the whole structure of the comity by which India and Pakistan have managed to live in a tolerable peace subsequent to partition. The military conflict which began in Kashmir a short time ago has already leaped across other parts of the frontiers

September 9, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

22441

between India and Pakistan, on both the east and the west. Reports tell of air raids against major cities and airdrops and other military activity in many places outside of Kashmir. With every passing hour the conflict seems to be gaining momentum.

Unless the present trend is promptly checked, there will be a Himalayan catastrophe in the Indo-Pakistani subcontinent. It will be fed not only by the issue of Kashmir but by a fierce national rivalry buttressed by the clashing forces of religious communalism. A fore-shadow of what may be involved is to be found in the struggle which accompanied partition, when it is estimated that half a million persons lost their lives and approximately 15 million people were uprooted from their homes and forced to seek refuge in one of the greatest transplantations of population in the history of mankind.

At the end of the present course lies, clearly, the wreckage of much of the great constructive endeavor which has been pursued successfully and against great odds in both India and Pakistan during the past 15 years. The work of a dedicated, indigenous leadership and a hard-working populace, the contribution of enormous amounts of aid from many nations, the political achievements wrought in the context of Commonwealth cooperation and evolution—all of this is subject to forfeit in the military storm which is now spreading.

It is easy enough to preach to both nations that they have everything to gain and nothing to lose by abstaining from violence. It is easy enough to urge peace on both India and Pakistan. But our own involvement in Vietnam—a far less complex situation—should underscore for us the gap between the great desirability of peace and the slim possibilities of its prompt restoration once it has given way.

Therefore, Mr. President, it would be my hope that we would exercise a measure of restraint insofar as platitudes on peace are concerned and, further, that we would avoid a unilateral course in this situation. No single outside nation, this Nation included, is likely by statements or even unilaterally determined policies to contribute very much to a restoration of peace. A good deal more is needed if, indeed, any outside effort is to be helpful in this situation.

The fact is that the Kashmir problem has been a matter of concern to the United Nations since 1949. The United Nations Security Council has been able, heretofore, to play a major role in maintaining the truce in Kashmir even though it has yet been unable to bring about a resolution of the basic issues. If there is any outside element which can be helpful in this situation it would appear to be, still, the Security Council assisted by the able Secretary-General of the United Nations, Mr. U Thant. Indeed, the Council, on September 4, took the first essential step when by unanimous vote it called for a cease-fire and a withdrawal of forces to the 1949 truce line in Kashmir. That call has so far been disregarded and indications are that other actions will have to be taken.

For us and for other nations that seek peace within the context of friendly relations with both India and Pakistan, the great necessity is for a common course at this critical time. It would appear to me that such a course is best achieved through the machinery and procedures of the Security Council, assisted by the Secretary-General. Decisions properly taken by that body are binding on every member of the United Nations. And, indeed, such decisions should have the firm support of member nations in view of the common stake of all in the restoration of peace.

It seems to me especially important at this time that the U.S. aid programs for India and Pakistan and those of other nations, and they are many, which are inextricably and, in all frankness, embarrassingly interwoven with this conflict must be made to serve the ends of a restoration of peace. Just how that can be done is not yet clear. But this Nation, it seems to me, ought to be prepared to join with other nations in a common pledge that aid programs in which they may be engaged in both India and Pakistan, within their present dimensions, will be adjusted at the request of and in accordance with any relevant decisions of the United Nations Security Council.

In the present critical situation the constructive value of all aid programs—military and economic—in both India and Pakistan is thrown into doubt. The President has acted wisely in promptly suspending shipments to both nations under the military aid program. Further adjustments in the interests of peace may be necessary. Flexibility is essential to the President if he is to make these adjustments effectively. He can be counted upon to act in close cooperation with the Congress. In this connection, it might be well to recall that the President, while subject to much criticism, refused to enter into any aid agreements for this fiscal year until Congress approved the authorizing foreign aid legislation and appropriated the necessary funds. It would appear to me that this is not only a sound approach in itself but is also indicative of his readiness to work closely with the Congress as circumstances develop. The complex and critical nature of the current situation, however, requires full support of the President and his representative at the United Nations Security Council. Together, they can press the views of this Nation and adjust them, as necessary, in the light of the views of others to the end that the aid programs of all may be brought to the full support of a United Nations effort to restore peace as quickly as possible.

TRIBUTES TO MAJORITY AND MINORITY LEADERS OF THE SENATE

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Russell of South Carolina in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. ELLENDER. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Maine, provided that

in doing so I shall not lose my right to the floor.

Mrs. SMITH. I thank the distinguished Senator from Louisiana for giving me this time.

Mr. President, the distinguished majority leader had some very kind and generous words for me in this Chamber yesterday and I am very grateful to him.

As we approach the close of this session, I want to pay my personal tribute to the majority leader for the splendid leadership that he has given the Senate. There may be those who feel that as a Republican I should restrain myself from giving such credit to him lest the Democrats use it for campaign ammunition. I do not feel that way. I feel that when a person has done an outstanding job that recognition should be given regardless of party affiliation. And if any of my enemies or critics in either the Democratic Party or the Republican Party wish to use this as an issue against me, I welcome them doing so.

In fact, I have been somewhat amused at some of my Democratic critics having cautioned other Democrats not to issue any words of praise about me lest I use those words to good advantage in campaigning for reelection.

But Mike Mansfield has done an excellent job and I am not about to deny him recognition on my part of his achievement merely because I am a member of the opposite political party. He has given the Senate the most orderly conduct of business that I have ever seen since I have been privileged to be a Member of this body. He has wisely and very effectively conducted the Senate's business in an unparalleled manner of avoiding late night sessions and Saturday sessions, both of which are not conducive to legislating in the best mental framework when Members are tired and their tempers affected by their fatigue.

And while paying tribute to the majority leader, I want to pay equal tribute to the minority leader. I have read some attacks on EVERETT DIRKSEN for not being partisan enough in his role as minority leader—for not being more of an opponent to the President's program—for being too cooperative.

Well, I have personally witnessed the political independence of EVERETT DIRKSEN. I have seen him oppose the President when he thought the President was wrong. I have seen how his actions and views have had a great influence on the President and caused the President to change his original views on legislation and his legislative program—and change constructively.

In the words of the President, EVERETT DIRKSEN is constructive instead of being merely negative—he is a builder instead of a wrecker. And the best testimonial to his constructive fairness, without diluting his duties as the leader of the loyal opposition, to the President's own high regard for EVERETT DIRKSEN and the very great degree to which he leans upon EVERETT DIRKSEN for guidance and advice.

Everybody knows this. But it is time that it should be said in defense of EVERETT DIRKSEN against his overly partisan

22442

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

September 9, 1965

critics. We Members of the Senate, on both sides of the aisle, share the high regard and esteem that the President of the United States holds for EVERETT DIRKSEN.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maine yield to me?

Mrs. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. I join with enthusiasm in what the distinguished Senator from Maine has just said. We have two superb Senate leaders. The majority leader, MIKE MANSFIELD, a man of high courage and conviction, is a great adornment to his country, his party, and to the Senate. Surely his counterpart, the minority leader, EVERETT DIRKSEN, is equally a great American leader, a great Republican leader, and a great Senate leader.

Any man or woman in public service who attempts to accomplish good for the people of this country may be subjected to cruel attack from time to time, and abuse on occasion, has come, without justification, to both of those men.

I regret that from time to time the leader of our party in the Senate, who has accomplished so much for his country by his leadership, has been the recipient of abuse as has been, also, his Democratic counterpart. Surely the comments of the Senator from Maine demonstrates what the feelings of Senators are with respect to the Democratic leader and the Republican leader in the Senate and what the feelings of the people of this country are with respect to them.

Mrs. SMITH. I thank the distinguished Senator from California for his comments.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maine yield to me?

Mrs. SMITH. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I take this opportunity to thank the distinguished Senator from Maine for her remarks and to join her wholeheartedly in what she has to say concerning the distinguished minority leader.

If the Senate is to function, there must be cooperation on both sides as a matter of necessity. Cooperation, understanding, and tolerance have been forthcoming at all times.

Let me say that it is good for me—really a tyro in politics—to work alongside an old “pro,” who rolls with the punches, who faces up to events as they occur, and who manages to emerge smiling most of the time.

Again I thank the distinguished Senator from Maine for her comments and to assure her that I appreciate them more than I can say.

Mrs. SMITH. I thank the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Will the charming lady from Maine yield to me?

Mrs. SMITH. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I can only salute and agree wholeheartedly with what the majority leader says in regard to the operation of the Senate.

Long ago, we agreed that the Senate is a public body which functions on a two-way street. If it were not so, the Senate would be in a constant state of disruption.

We dedicate ourselves to the business of making the Senate a functioning body.

I am grateful, indeed, for the kind words.

As for the abuse, I roll with the tide. For more than 30 years I have been subjected to criticism of one kind or another. I do not retaliate. I do not reply in kind. I am content to take criticism in stride, because that is one of the things to which one must become inured in public service.

I am grateful to the Senator from Maine for her kind remarks.

Mrs. SMITH. I thank the minority leader very much.

A TRIBUTE TO MINORITY LEADER EVERETT M. DIRKSEN

Mr. SIMPSON. Will the Senator from Maine yield?

Mrs. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, we have just heard a marvelous tribute given to our minority leader, Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN. I have asked permission to associate myself with the expert views of the gracious lady from Maine [Mrs. SMITH].

“Ev” DIRKSEN is Nature’s nobleman and a great leader with a warm heart and unimpeachable integrity. He and his wife, Lou, deserve the tributes which have just been paid to them.

I thank the Senator from Maine.

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, I apologize to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] for taking all this time, when it was not my time to yield, and I hope that he will bear with me.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator from Maine is most welcome.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ACT OF 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 9811) to maintain farm income, to stabilize prices and assure adequate supplies of agricultural commodities, to reduce surpluses, lower Government costs and promote foreign trade, to afford greater economic opportunity in rural areas, and for other purposes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, for the past 3 or 4 months, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has been giving very serious consideration to the many problems facing agriculture.

As we all know, the farm price support program really had its start in 1938. What the Congress has done since that

time has been to add to and subtract from the original proposals made in 1938.

It will be remembered that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry at that time held hearings throughout the country, at the grassroots, to obtain all the information possible with which to draft a bill in keeping with what was thought to be to the advantage of the producers of our Nation.

There is no doubt that we must by all means keep our farming community on the go and provide it with a fair income. Our entire economy is dependent on agriculture. One need only visit various parts of the world to discover what it means for a country to be incapable of producing its own food, and fiber requirements. Many countries have neglected their precious land and water resources.

As a consequence, their economies deteriorated.

Many years ago Persia, which consisted of the present territory occupied by Iraq and Iran, was able to produce sufficient food to take care of 100 million people. The great valley of Mesopotamia, between the Tigris and the Euphrates Rivers, was able to grow food for as many as 15 million people.

I visited those areas. But, because of the neglect of the people in the protection of their land and water resources, the great Mesopotamia Valley is able to grow food now for only about 5 million people. Their lands have soured. Their streams have clogged. The great port of Basra, which used to be on the Persian Gulf, is now removed about 30 miles upstream.

What was the reason? The sedimentation from those two great rivers, the Euphrates and the Tigris, came down and not only built into the Persian Gulf, but clogged the many streams that emptied into those two great rivers and made much of the land more or less barren.

We do not want such a condition ever to exist in our own country.

Mr. President, long before I came to the Senate I devoted much time and study to the protection and preservation of our two great resources. I am proud of the fact that, as a Senator from Louisiana, I have been able to carry on this work as chairman of the Public Works Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, as well as chairman of the Agriculture and Forestry committee of the Senate.

I have been serving on the latter committee since I came to the Senate, almost 29 years ago. All of the legislation affecting our farms, affecting conservation, and other laws affecting agriculture and the protection and preservation of our water resources came under my view. I was there to participate and assist in passing legislation to protect and preserve those great resources.

Mr. President, it has often been said that the cost of our programs has been too high. I have so stated on many occasions, but when we consider the great factory that has been built over the years, in which we can now produce food and fiber in abundance, to feed not

September 9, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

22399

it not unusual to schedule so many resolutions on 1 day?

Mr. ALBERT. I would not say it was unusual. I would say we do have a pretty heavy schedule for next week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR
WEDNESDAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of next week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

"THE PEOPLE CALL IT SPORT"—
BOOK BY HARRY WISMER

(Mr. FOGARTY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, a familiar figure in Washington for several years—Harry Wismer, a coowner of the Redskins from 1950 to 1960—is still going strong. He has just completed a book about professional football called "The People Call It Sport." I have not seen the book and therefore can make no comment on it. However, I remember Mr. Wismer as one of the Nation's outstanding sports broadcasters for many years, and especially his handling of the annual golf matches sponsored by the Washington Star for the benefit of the deprived youngsters of this great city. This annual golf match, participated in by Members of Congress and the Senate, and members of the Cabinet and screen stars, raised thousands of dollars to help in this cause.

CELEBRATION OF ADMISSION DAY
FOR CALIFORNIA

(Mr. DYAL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, 115 years ago today California became the 31st State of the Union. Now the Bear State is first in population. Naturally, we Californians think of her as being first in many other aspects than population: in agriculture; in her natural resources; her climate; her citrus and her new aerospace technologies and her amazing Feather River water plan.

Lately our State has also been included in the social problems of this new era. Problems are not unknown to a California that weathered the gold strikes, the oil booms, the grapes of wrath era, and other difficulties.

Obviously we are going to need wisdom and understanding as well as firmness in holding to law and order to solve our problems, in both the humane as well as the legal aspects.

We love our State and we brag about her—possibly only taking second place to Texas in this regard.

This being admission day it is hoped that California and all that the name indicates; an adventuresome spirit will cause us to join with our sister States in bringing our Nation to its highest fulfillment in the destiny of mankind.

BIG GRAIN DEALERS PUSHING
WHEAT TO RUSSIA HAVE FOREIGN
FLAGSHIPS

(Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the Senate has begun to debate the 1965 farm bill. As we know, efforts will be made in the Senate to remove the road-block against U.S. wheat sales to Russia; namely, the requirement that at least half such wheat be hauled in American ships.

It must be brought out that only a few large U.S. grain dealers would benefit from selling wheat to Russia. Not only would these few dealers reap profits from the actual sales, but they have financial interests in foreign-flag shipping companies which would also profit from the removal of the 50 percent reserve set aside for American shippers.

For example, Continental Grain Co. of New York City, which figured prominently in the 1963 United States-Russia wheat deal, is shown as connected with the United Steamship Corp. of Panama.

Cargill, Inc., of Minneapolis, Minn., prominent in 1963 sales of U.S. wheat to Eastern European Red satellites, has shipping agent subsidiaries in Argentina, West Germany, the Netherlands, Belgium, Denmark, England, Japan, and Italy which simply rechartered foreign ships to U.S. based Cargill, Inc. shipments to Communist countries.

No wonder the powerful grain lobby wants to not only sell wheat to Russia, but ship it all aboard foreign lines.

I urge those who are concerned with upholding a strong U.S. foreign policy, and rebuilding a strong American shipping industry as well, to join in halting the sale of U.S. wheat, subsidized by the American taxpayers, to Russia and other Communist countries.

ADMISSION OF COMMUNIST CHINA
INTO THE UNITED NATIONS

(Mr. FINO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, nothing disturbed me more than the recent news that a number of African and Asian countries in the United Nations have formally requested that the question of admitting Communist China to the United Nations be put on the discussion agenda.

Until 1960, the United States successfully prevented the question of Communist China's admission from being considered by the United Nations. Unfortunately, the Democratic administrations in power since 1961 have not been so skillful. Slowly but surely they have

been losing the battle to keep Communist China out of the United Nations.

I hope that our new team at the United Nations will be able to reverse this trend, but I doubt it. This administration has failed completely in winning the Afro-Asian nations to support our position with respect to admitting Communist China to the United Nations. This despite the fact that Communist China is openly stirring up subversion throughout both continents. I hope that this is not the year we are to pay the price of this failure by seeing Communist China admitted to the United Nations. It would be a great blow to the strength of our position in Asia and certainly a black day for America.

THE AMERICAN RED CROSS

(Mr. MICHEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked and angered to learn that the American Red Cross is specifying imported wire in its buying orders to dealers. A manufacturer of steel wire in my district has reported to me that its Seattle, Wash., branch complained that the Red Cross specified foreign made wire for fencing to replace flood-damaged fences in the Northwest.

It is my understanding that the American National Red Cross has been supplying fence for the flood victims in the Pacific Northwest all through the spring of 1965 and in every case they have specified "import wire."

It is also my understanding they have done such a land-office business that on some orders they have even used a rubber stamp "import only" to speed up their paperwork.

Mr. Speaker, this action is indeed ill considered. It damages the U.S. balance-of-payments position. It is also the height of arrogance for an organization that exists largely on the generous donations of business firms, including steel wire companies, to spend its money on foreign goods. It is working at cross-purposes to deny the business that its operations generate to the American firms that are its financial lifeline. The American Red Cross should be all-American—including buying American. Otherwise it may find itself a financial disaster area, in need of fiscal first aid.

CHARTING THE GREAT SOCIETY

(Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record, and to include a newspaper announcement.)

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, there is a feature that distinguishes all of the great Presidential programs throughout our history. They have all been based on deep insight into the Nation's needs and a bold vision of its destiny.

President Johnson's Great Society program is in that tradition. It is based on the clear recognition that the continued existence of poverty in this great Nation is the biggest barrier to our economic and

22400

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

September 9, 1965

social progress, and that we can no longer delay in the campaign to drive it from our midst.

Achieving the Great Society will be a big job, and it will take a long time to do it, but the time to begin is now. We have the power; we have the strength; we have the will. Delay would not only be self-defeating, insofar as our aims and aspirations are concerned, but it would be inhumane and heartless, for poverty and its evil consequences need not continue to afflict a substantial minority of Americans.

It is the people of this Nation who constitute its greatest wealth. Eliminating poverty and dependency is a double investment: it gets rid of a liability—someone, who has to be carried along by other members of society—and, in its place, creates a producer who contributes his share of goods and services to the community. As the people of this Nation undertake to bring about the Great Society, we in the Congress must be vigilant in learning the dimensions of the job to be done and, even more important, knowing where to place our greatest efforts. The Joint Economic Committee will do its part in helping to navigate the course ahead.

Members of Congress have expressed their interest in the Joint Economic Committee's undertaking in this regard and so, no doubt, many members of the public are equally interested in the committee's current activities in the field of human progress. For this reason, I would like to include in the RECORD a brief announcement describing in somewhat more detail the current and proposed activities of the Joint Economic Committee in respect to human resources and the Great Society programs:

WRIGHT PATMAN, Democrat, of Texas, chairman of the Joint Economic Committee, today announced that the committee's Subcommittee on Economic Progress, which he also chairs, will investigate the basic economic problems that the Nation will face in achieving the Great Society.

"The biggest factor in economic growth is neither natural resources nor machinery," said the Texan. "It's people. President Johnson's Great Society programs are designed to assure continued growth and prosperity of our society by stepping up the national investment in people. They are not only the ultimate consumers and beneficiaries of society; they are equally its producers.

"The subcommittee's economic investigations will focus on the new Great Society developments in order that the Congress and the public can have a more precise knowledge of their scope, their mode of operation, and their effect on the economy. Such information is vitally necessary to the Congress in making wise decisions on programs intended to reduce poverty and bring about economic and social improvement."

Chairman PATMAN indicated that one study now underway will attempt to project the course of the economy over the next 10 years and assess the economic problems that will face policymakers in that period. He cited employment, tax policy, public expenditures, and technological change as issues involving big decisions with major implications for our economic development.

A second study will analyze the many Federal programs that are directly concerned with human resources, including appraisal of their effects on the economy and contribution to achievement of the objectives of the

Employment Act. Mr. PATMAN noted that the coordination of such programs would come in for close scrutiny, particularly since the Employment Act requires that the Joint Economic Committee study means of coordinating programs to further the purposes of the act.

A third subject of inquiry revealed by the chairman is the growing need for financing by State and local authorities to construct the schools, hospitals, and other public buildings needed to sustain our growth over the next decade. He pointed out that States and localities have been increasing their borrowing requirements by \$12 billion a year and that their total outstanding debt is now over \$90 billion. "They are more and more dependent on capital markets," he said, "and more vulnerable to interest rate increases. A community that builds a \$1 million facility and borrows the money at 4 percent for 25 years, eventually has to raise \$2 million—twice as much. This is the arithmetic that weighs upon many a local official."

A fourth inquiry will concern itself with the problems of automation, particularly the rapid computerization of industry and commerce.

The chairman said that as studies progress, hearings will be held.

INDIA AND PAKISTAN

(Mr. TODD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, we look with dismay upon the mortal struggle in which two of our friends—India and Pakistan—have become engaged. The resolution by force of their dispute will leave neither stronger, richer, happier, or more capable of meeting the needs and fulfilling the hopes of its citizens. The heads of both governments are educated and sophisticated leaders, great patriots, and deeply religious. And yet they are now engaged in a conflict which can have no happy outcome, and which, if left alone, they can only resolve by bleeding and exhaustion.

The cause of this fight lies in who shall ultimately exercise sovereignty over Kashmir, a province which has been in dispute since the partition of India, and in which the forces of India and Pakistan has been kept apart until last week by United Nations teams.

The inability of the United Nations to maintain a truce, when it does not possess overwhelming force, when two national interests collide, is inevitable. And yet short of an intervention, in this case by an alliance of major powers who are agreed upon the objective of stopping this war, it may not end without the full peacemaking potential of the United Nations being imposed upon both sides. Should efforts of the United Nations fail, and should any single major power attempt to impose a settlement by threat of force, other powers would most certainly be brought in and a disastrous enlargement of the conflict would result.

Consequently, Mr. Speaker, I believe it imperative that Members of this Chamber reaffirm their conviction that the United Nations is the proper and best medium for resolving this conflict: That we back the administration in its determination to support the United Nations and its Secretary General; that we recognize that the full moral and perhaps

physical strength of the United Nations will have to be used to convince India and Pakistan that a bloody war will only perpetuate and increase the causes of the hostility.

I hope that our energies will strengthen the United Nations, and that from this crisis can be developed methods and means of quickly and peacefully resolving the conflicts which lead to wars, as well as stopping the wars themselves.

INDIA-PAKISTAN CONFLICT

(Mr. BINGHAM asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the hopes and prayers of hundreds of millions of people around the world go with the Secretary General of the United Nations, U Thant, as he travels to India and Pakistan in an effort to achieve a cease-fire and a withdrawal of all armed forces to the 1949 cease-fire line.

His visit was of course authorized by two unanimous resolutions in the United Nations Security Council.

Those individuals and groups, both in the United States and elsewhere, who believe that Communist China should replace Nationalist China in the United Nations Security Council would do well to reflect on what the situation would be today if that substitution had been made. Pakistan has so far indicated its opposition to these resolutions, and there seems to be no doubt that Communist China would have vetoed the resolutions if it had been sitting in China's chair as a permanent member of the Security Council.

Communist China's friends and admirers around the world would also do well to ponder the significance of Communist China's support of Pakistan. Obviously, this support is not based on any ideological considerations but represents nothing more than simple power politics. The fact that Communist China is an active partisan in the conflict, instead of joining with most of the rest of the world in deploring the conflict and seeking to end it, is a further proof that Communist China openly rejects the pursuit of peace, the basic premise of the United Nations Charter.

(Mrs. GREEN of Oregon asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

[Mrs. GREEN of Oregon addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

THE HUMAN INVESTMENT ACT OF 1965: A NEW APPROACH TO MEETING THE CHALLENGE OF UNEMPLOYMENT

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] is recognized for 60 minutes.

(Mr. CURTIS asked and was given permission for all Members to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter.)